arXiv:1510.06346v1 [math.PR] 21 Oct 2015

SCALING LIMITS FOR THE CRITICAL FORTUIN-KASTELYN MODEL ON A RANDOM PLANAR MAP III: FINITE VOLUME CASE

EWAIN GWYNNE AND XIN SUN

Abstract. We prove scaling limit results for the finite-volume version of the inventory accumulation model of Sheffield (2011), which encodes a random planar map decorated by a collection of loops sampled from the critical Fortuin-Kasteleyn (FK) model. In particular, we prove that the random walk associated with the finite-volume version of this model converges in the scaling limit to a correlated Brownian motion $\dot{Z}$ conditioned to stay in the first quadrant for two units of time and satisfy $\dot{Z}(2) = 0$. We also show that the times which describe complementary connected components of FK loops in the discrete model converge to the $\pi/2$-cone times of $\dot{Z}$. Combined with recent results of Duplantier, Miller, and Sheffield, our results imply that many interesting functionals of the FK loops on a finite-volume FK planar map (e.g. their boundary lengths and areas) converge in the scaling limit to the corresponding "quantum" functionals of the CLE_κ loops on a $4/\sqrt{\kappa}$-Liouville quantum gravity sphere for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. Our results are finite-volume analogues of the scaling limit theorems for the infinite-volume version of the inventory accumulation model proven by Sheffield (2011) and Gwynne, Mao, and Sun (2015).

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Notation and preliminaries 4
1.2. Statements of main results 6
1.3. Outline 8
2. Conditioned Brownian motion 11
2.1. Definitions and characterization lemmas 11
2.2. A more explicit construction of a correlated Brownian loop in the first quadrant 11
3. Existence of a large loop 15
3.1. Statement and relationships between events 15
3.2. Defining events in terms of the FK planar map 17
3.3. Proof of Proposition 3.2 19
3.4. Proof of Lemma 3.9 22
4. Existence of a time with enough cheeseburger orders 23
4.1. Probability of few cheeseburgers before a given number of hamburgers 24
4.2. Monotonicity conditioned on cheeseburgers being matched to cheeseburger orders 26
4.3. Regularity conditioned on few cheeseburgers before a given number of hamburgers 27
4.4. Proof of Proposition 4.2 31
5. Local estimates for the last segment of the word 33
5.1. Regular variation 35
5.2. Lower bound 36
5.3. Upper bound when the tip of the path is in the bulk 37
5.4. Stronger upper bounds 42
5.5. Regularity for the last segment of the word 44
5.6. Proofs of Propositions 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 46
6. Conclusion of the proofs 48

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60F17, 60G50; Secondary 82B27.

Key words and phrases. Fortuin-Kasteleyn model, random planar maps, hamburger-cheeseburger bijection, random walks in cones, scaling limits, Liouville quantum gravity, conformal loop ensembles.

6.1. Tightness 49
6.2. Convergence conditioned on an exit position at macroscopic distance from 0 50
6.3. Existence of a macroscopic cone interval 56
6.4. Proof of Theorem 1.8 61
6.5. Proof of Theorem 1.11 64
References 66

1. Introduction

Let $\Theta = \{\textcircled{H}, \textcircled{C}, \boxed{H}, \boxed{C}, \boxed{F}\}$. The set of finite words consisting of elements of Θ, modulo the relations

$$\textcircled{C}\boxed{C} = \textcircled{H}\boxed{H} = \textcircled{C}\boxed{F} = \textcircled{H}\boxed{F} = \emptyset, \qquad \textcircled{C}\boxed{H} = \boxed{H}\textcircled{C}, \qquad \textcircled{H}\boxed{C} = \boxed{C}\textcircled{H} \tag{1}$$

forms a semigroup, which was first introduced by Sheffield in [She11]. Given a word x consisting of elements of Θ, we write $\mathcal{R}(x)$ for its reduction modulo the relations (1), with all burgers to the right of all orders. Following [She11], we think of elements of Θ as representing a hamburger, a cheeseburger, a hamburger order, a cheeseburger order, and a flexible order (i.e. a request for the "freshest available" burger of either type), respectively. A word x consisting of elements of Θ (read from left to right) represents a sequence of burgers being produced and orders being placed. Whenever an order is placed, it is fulfilled by the first burger of the appropriate type to the left of this order which has not yet been consumed. The reduced word $\mathcal{R}(x)$ represents the set of unfulfilled orders (which were placed at a time when no suitable burgers were available) and the set of unconsumed burgers.

The reason for our interest in the semigroup Θ is that there is a bijection, described in [She11, Section 4.1], between words $\dot{X}$ consisting of $2n$ elements of Θ, with the property that $\mathcal{R}(\dot{X}) = \emptyset$; and triples (M, e_0, S) consisting of a planar map M with n edges, an oriented root edge e_0 of M, and a distinguished subset of the set of edges of M. This bijection generalizes a bijection due to Mullin [Mul67] (see also [Ber07] for a more explicit description) and is essentially equivalent to the construction of [Ber08, Section 4] for a fixed choice of planar map M. The edge set S gives rise to a collection of loops $\mathcal{L}$ on M (described by sequences of edges in a certain quadrangulation $Q = Q(M)$ associated with M) which form interfaces between edges in S and edges of the dual map M^* which do not cross edges of S.

For $p \in [0,1]$, define a probability measure on Θ by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\textcircled{H}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\textcircled{C}\right) = \frac{1}{4}, \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\boxed{H}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\boxed{C}\right) = \frac{1-p}{4}, \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\boxed{F}\right) = \frac{p}{2}. \tag{2}$$

Let $X = \dots X_{-1} X_0 X_1 \dots$ be a bi-infinite word whose symbols are iid samples from the probability measure (2). If $p \in (0, 1/2)$ and we sample a word $\dot{X}$ according to the conditional law of $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$ given $\{\mathcal{R}(X_1 \dots X_{2n}) = \emptyset\}$, then (as explained in [She11, Section 4.2]) the law of the triple $(M, e_0, \mathcal{L})$ is given by the uniform measure on such triples weighted by $q^{\#\mathcal{L}/2}$, where $q = 4p^2/(1-p)^2 \in (0,4)$. This implies that the conditional law of $\mathcal{L}$ given M is that of the *critical Fortuin-Kasteleyn (FK) cluster model with parameter q* on M [FK72], which is closely related to the q-state Potts model for integer values of q (see [KN04, Gri06] and the references therein for more on the FK model). We call a pair $(M, \mathcal{L})$ sampled according to this probability measure a *(critical) FK planar map of size n* and the triple $(M, e_0, \mathcal{L})$ a *rooted (critical) FK planar map of size n*.

As alluded to in [She11], there is also an infinite-volume version of the above bijection, which relates infinite-volume FK planar maps and bi-infinite words X with elements sampled independently according to the probabilities (2). See [Che15, BLR15] for more details.

The law of of the FK planar map $(M, \mathcal{L})$ is conjectured to converge in the scaling limit at $n \to \infty$ to the law of a *conformal loop ensemble* (CLE_κ) [She09, SW12, MS12a, MS12b, MS12c, MS13a] on top of an independent *γ-Liouville quantum gravity surface* [DS11, She10, DMS14], where $\kappa \in (4,8)$ and

$\gamma \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$ satisfy

$$q = \frac{4p^2}{(1-p)^2} = 2 + 2\cos(8\pi/\kappa) \qquad \gamma = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\kappa}}. \tag{3}$$

In the special case $p = 1/3$, the marginal law of the planar map M (without the collection of loops $\mathcal{L}$) is uniform on all such maps. Uniform random planar maps and their scaling limits have been studied extensively. In particular, a uniformly chosen random quadrangulation with $2n$ edges converges in law in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology to a continuum random metric space called the *Brownian map* [LG13, Mie13]. See [Mie09, Le 14] and the references therein for more details. In [MS13b, MS15e, MS15a, MS15b, MS15c, MS15d], Miller and Sheffield construct a metric on LQG for $\gamma = \sqrt{8/3}$ under which it is isometric to the Brownian map.

In [She11, Theorem 2.5], it is shown that a certain non-Markovian random walk associated with the bi-infinite word X sampled according to the probabilities (2) converges in the scaling limit to a pair of correlated two-sided Brownian motions $Z = (U, V)$, started from $Z(0) = 0$ and satisfying

$$\mathrm{Var}(U(t)) = \frac{1-p}{2}|t| \quad \mathrm{Var}(V(t)) = \frac{1-p}{2}|t| \quad \mathrm{Cov}(U(t), V(t)) = \frac{p}{2}|t|, \qquad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4}$$

On the other hand, it was recently shown by Duplantier, Miller, and Sheffield [DMS14] that a whole-plane CLE_κ [KW14, MWW14b] on a certain infinite-volume Liouville quantum gravity (LQG) surface called a *γ-quantum cone* can be encoded by a correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion $Z = (U, V)$ via a continuum analogue of the bijection of [She11, Section 4.1]. This encoding is called the *peanosphere construction* and can be interpreted as a mating of two correlated continuum random trees [Ald91a, Ald91b, Ald93]. Thus [She11, Theorem 2.5] can be interpreted as the statement that the contour functions for infinite-volume FK planar maps converge in the scaling limit to the contour function of a CLE_κ on a γ-quantum cone. In other words, one has convergence of infinite-volume FK planar maps toward a CLE_κ-decorated γ-quantum cone the so-called *peanosphhere topology*. In [GMS15, Theorem 1.9], this convergence statement is strengthened by proving that the times corresponding to complementary connected components FK loops in Sheffield's bijection converge in the scaling limit to the $\pi/2$-cone times of the correlated Brownian motion Z, which encode complementary connected components of CLE_κ loops in the construction of [DMS14].

In [MS15e, Theorem 1.1], the authors prove that one can encode a CLE_κ on a finite-volume LQG surface called a *quantum sphere* via a constant multiple of a correlated Brownian motion $\dot{Z}$ with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant for two units of time and satisfy $\dot{Z}(2) = 0$ (this conditioning is made precise in [MS15e, Section 3]; see also Section 2 of the present paper). Hence, it is natural to expect that the random walk associated with a word $\dot{X} = X_1 \dots X_{2n}$ sampled from the inventory accumulation model conditioned on the event that $\mathcal{R}(\dot{X}) = \emptyset$ (which encodes a finite-volume FK planar map) converges in the scaling limit to a correlated Brownian motion $\dot{Z}$ conditioned to stay in first quadrant for two units of time and satisfy $\dot{Z}(2) = 0$. This statement implies the convergence of finite-volume FK planar maps toward CLE_κ on an independent LQG sphere in the peanosphere topology.

In this paper we will prove the above scaling limit statement, thereby extending [She11, Theorem 2.5] to the finite volume case. We will also obtain an exact analogue of [GMS15, Theorem 1.9], which will imply, among other things, that the boundary lengths and areas of complementary connected components of FK loops on a random planar map on the sphere converge in the scaling limit to the quantum lengths and areas of complementary connected components of CLE_κ loops on a γ-quantum sphere. This latter result answers [DMS14, Question 13.3] in the finite-volume case. Furthermore, the results of this paper will be used by the first author and J. Miller in [GM15b] to prove a stronger scaling limit result for FK planar maps (i.e. the convergence of the law of the entire topological structure of the FK loops on an FK planar map to that of CLE_κ on an independent γ-quantum sphere). The scaling limit result of [GM15b], in turn, will be used in the subsequent work [GM15a] to prove that the law of whole-plane CLE_κ is invariant under inversion for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ (see [KW14] for a proof in the case when $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$).

The vast majority of the arguments in the present paper use only basic properties of the hamburger-cheeseburger model and the results of [She11, GMS15, GS15], and can be read without any knowledge of CLE_κ or Liouville quantum gravity. However, unlike the proofs of the estimates and scaling limit results for the hamburger-cheeseburger model proven in prior works [She11, GMS15, GS15, BLR15], our proofs (in particular the arguments in Section 3) will make some use properties of FK planar maps, the bijection of [She11], and the relationship between these objects and CLE_κ on an independent Liouville quantum gravity cone established in [DMS14, GMS15, GM15b]. We also use the scaling limit results of [She11, GMS15], the estimates of [GS15], and at one point the infinite-volume version of the scaling limit results of [GM15b].

Remark 1.1. The paper [GM15b] (currently in preparation) introduces a topological structure called a *lamination* associated with a collection of non-crossing loops, an area measure, and a boundary length measure, which (under certain hypotheses) determines the collection of loops and the two measures modulo an ambient homeomorphism of $\mathbb{C}$. It is then proven that the lamination of the FK loops on an FK planar map converges in law to the lamination of a CLE_κ on an independent Liouville quantum gravity surface with parameter γ, where κ, γ, and p are related as in (3). This is accomplished for both infinite-volume and finite-volume FK planar maps (which correspond to the case where the quantum surface is a γ-quantum cone or a quantum sphere, respectively; see [DMS14] for definitions). In both cases, the scaling limit result is proven by explicitly describing the lamination of an FK planar map (resp. a CLE_κ on an LQG surface) in terms of the word in Sheffield's bijection (resp. the Brownian motion in the peanosphere construction of [DMS14, MS15e]); then applying [She11, Theorem 2.5] and [GMS15, Theorem 1.9] (in the infinite-volume case) or Theorems 1.8 and 1.11 of the present paper (in the finite-volume case), plus some additional estimates (some of which use the results of [GS15]). The only significant difference between the proofs in the two cases is which of these pairs of theorems is applied. In particular, the infinite-volume version of the result of [GM15b] is proven independently of the present paper. This point is crucial, as at one step of the proof of the main results of the present paper (in particular the proof of Lemma 3.9), we need to apply the infinite-volume version of the main result of [GM15b] in order to estimate the probability of a certain event defined in terms of an infinite-volume FK planar map. We note, however, that the proof of inversion invariance of whole-plane CLE_κ in [GM15a] requires the finite-volume version of [GM15b]. In summary, we have the following implication relations between various results (here an arrow from one result to another means that the proof of the second result uses the first result).



Acknowledgments We thank Nina Holden, Cheng Mao, Jason Miller, and Scott Sheffield for helpful discussions. We thank the Isaac Newton Institute for its hospitality during part of our work on this project. The first author was supported by the U.S. Department of Defense via an NDSEG fellowship. The second author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1209044.

1.1. Notation and preliminaries.

In this section we will introduce some notation which will remain fixed throughout the paper. This notation is in agreement with that used in [GMS15, GS15].

1.1.1. *Basic notation.* Here we record some basic notations which we will use throughout this paper.

Definition 1.2. Let X be a random variable taking values in a countable state space Ω. A *realization* of X is an element $x \in \Omega$ such that $\mathbb{P}(X = x) > 0$.

Notation 1.3. *For $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the discrete intervals $[a, b]_{\mathbb{Z}} := [a, b] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ and $(a, b)_{\mathbb{Z}} := (a, b) \cap \mathbb{Z}$.*

Notation 1.4. *If a and b are two quantities, we write $a \preceq b$ (resp. $a \succeq b$) if there is a constant C (independent of the parameters of interest) such that $a \leq Cb$ (resp. $a \geq Cb$). We write $a \asymp b$ if $a \preceq b$ and $a \succeq b$.*

Notation 1.5. *If a and b are two quantities which depend on a parameter x, we write $a = o_x(b)$ (resp. $a = O_x(b)$) if $a/b \to 0$ (resp. a/b remains bounded) as $x \to 0$ (or as $x \to \infty$, depending on context). We write $a = o_x^{\infty}(b)$ if $a = o_x(b^s)$ for each $s > 0$ (if b is tending to 0) or for each $s < 0$ (if b is tending to ∞). The regime we are considering will be clear from the context.*

Unless otherwise stated, all implicit constants in $\asymp, \preceq$, and $\succeq$ and $O_x(\cdot)$ and $o_x(\cdot)$ errors involved in the proof of a result are required to satisfy the same dependencies as described in the statement of said result.

1.1.2. *Inventory accumulation model.* Let $p \in (0, 1/2)$. We will always treat p as fixed and do not make dependence on p explicit.

Let $\Theta = \{\textcircled{\text{H}}, \textcircled{\text{C}}, \boxed{\text{H}}, \boxed{\text{C}}, \boxed{\text{F}}\}$ be the generating set for the semigroup described above. Given a word x consisting of elements of Θ, we denote by $\mathcal{R}(x)$ the word reduced modulo the relations (1), with all burgers to the right of all orders, as above. We also write $|x|$ for the number of symbols in x (regardless of whether or not x is reduced).

Let $X = \dots X_{-1} X_0 X_1 \dots$ be a bi-infinite word with each symbol sampled independently according to the probabilities (2). For $a \leq b \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$X(a, b) := \mathcal{R}\left(X_{\lfloor a \rfloor} \dots X_{\lfloor b \rfloor}\right). \tag{5}$$

We adopt the convention that $X(a, b) = \emptyset$ if $b < a$.

By [She11, Proposition 2.2], it is a.s. the case that the "infinite reduced word" $X(-\infty, \infty)$ is empty, i.e. each symbol X_i in the word X has a unique match which cancels it out in the reduced word.

Notation 1.6. *For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we write $\phi(i)$ for the index of the match of X_i.*

Notation 1.7. *For $\theta \in \Theta$ and a word x consisting of elements of Θ, we write $\mathcal{N}_\theta(x)$ for the number of θ-symbols in x. We also let*

$$d(x) := \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{H}}(x) - \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(x), \quad d^*(x) := \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{C}}(x) - \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{C}}(x), \quad D(x) := (d(x), d^*(x)) \tag{6}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{h}(x) := \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(\mathcal{R}(x)), \quad \mathfrak{c}(x) := \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{C}}(\mathcal{R}(x)), \quad \mathfrak{o}(x) := \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(\mathcal{R}(x)) + \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{F}}(\mathcal{R}(x)) + 1. \tag{7}$$

We note that the definitions of $\mathfrak{h}(x)$ and $\mathfrak{c}(x)$ in (7) differ from the definitions in [GS15, Definition 3.1] (the definitions in this paper concern orders, whereas the definitions in [GS15] concern burgers).

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define $Y_i = X_i$ if $X_i \in \{\textcircled{\text{H}}, \textcircled{\text{C}}, \boxed{\text{H}}, \boxed{\text{C}}\}$; $Y_i = \boxed{\text{H}}$ if $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and $X_{\phi(i)} = \textcircled{\text{H}}$; and $Y_i = \boxed{\text{C}}$ if $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and $X_{\phi(i)} = \textcircled{\text{C}}$. For $a \leq b \in \mathbb{R}$, define $Y(a, b)$ as in (5) with Y in place of X.

For $n \geq 0$, define $d(n) = d(Y(1, n))$ and for $n < 0$, define $d(n) = -d(Y(n + 1, 0))$. Define $d^*(n)$ similarly. Extend each of these functions from $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ by linear interpolation. Let

$$D(t) := (d(t), d^*(t)). \tag{8}$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$U^n(t) := n^{-1/2} d(nt), \quad V^n(t) := n^{-1/2} d^*(nt), \quad Z^n(t) := (U^n(t), V^n(t)). \tag{9}$$

It is easy to see that the condition that $X(1, 2n) = \emptyset$ is equivalent to the condition that $Z^n([0, 2]) \subset [0, \infty)^2$ and $Z^n(2) = 0$.

Let $Z = (U, V)$ be a two-sided two-dimensional Brownian motion with $Z(0) = 0$ and variances and covariances as in (4). It is shown in [She11, Theorem 2.5] that as $n \to \infty$, the random paths Z^n defined in (9) converge in law in the topology of uniform convergence on compacts to the random path Z of (4).

There are several stopping times for the word X, read backward, which we will use throughout this paper. Namely, let

$$J := \inf \{ j \in \mathbb{N} : X(-j, -1) \text{ contains a burger} \}, \tag{10}$$

so that $\{J > n\}$ is the event that $X(-n, -1)$ contains no burgers. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$J_m^H := \inf \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{H}}(X(-j, -1)) = m \right\}, \quad L_m^H := d^* \left(X(-J_m^H, -1) \right) \tag{11}$$

be, respectively, the mth time a hamburger is added to the stack when we read X backward and the number of cheeseburgers minus the number of cheeseburger orders in $X(-J_m^H, -1)$. Define J_m^C and L_m^C similarly with the roles of hamburgers and cheeseburgers interchanged.

Let

$$\mu := \frac{\pi}{2\left(\pi - \arctan \frac{\sqrt{1-2p}}{p}\right)} = \frac{\kappa}{8} \in (1/2, 1), \tag{12}$$

with p and κ related as in (3). The number μ arises frequently in the study of the hamburger-cheeseburger model with parameter p. For example, it is shown in [GMS15] that the probability that the correlated Brownian motion Z stays in the $\delta^{1/2}$-neighborhood of the first quadrant for 1 unit of time is proportional to δ^{μ} (Lemma 2.2; see also [Shi85]); the probability that $X(1, n)$ contains no orders is regularly varying with exponent μ (Proposition 5.1); and $X(1, n)$ typically contains at most $n^{-(1-\mu)+o_n(1)}$ flexible orders (Corollary 5.2). It is also shown in [GS15, Theorem 1.10] that the probability that $X(1, 2n) = \emptyset$ is proportional to $n^{-1-2\mu+o_n(1)}$. See [BLR15] for some additional calculations relating to the exponent μ.

1.2. **Statements of main results.** The first main result of this paper is the following finite-volume analogue of [She11].

Theorem 1.8. *Let $\dot{Z} = (\dot{U}, \dot{V})$ be a correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion as in (4) started from 0 conditioned to stay in the first quadrant during the time interval $[0, 2]$ and satisfy $\dot{Z}(2) = 0$. Also define the paths Z^n for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as in (9). As $n \to \infty$, the conditional law of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$ converges to the law of $\dot{Z}$ (with respect to the topology of uniform convergence).*

The correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion $\dot{Z}$ conditioned to stay in the first quadrant during the time interval $[0, 2]$ and satisfy $\dot{Z}(2) = 0$ can be viewed as the two-dimensional analogue of a Brownian excursion. The process $\dot{Z}$ is defined and rigorously constructed in [MS15e, Section 3]. See Section 2 for a review of the definition of this process as well as an alternative (more explicit) construction. We remark that the one-dimensional distributions of correlated Brownian motion conditioned to stay in the first quadrant (as well as those of a more general class of conditioned Brownian motions) are computed in [DW15a, Theorem 6].

As noted above, [MS15e, Theorem 1.1] implies that our Theorem 1.8 can be interpreted as the statement that the contour function of a finite-volume FK planar map converges in the scaling limit to the analogous function for a CLE_κ on a γ-quantum sphere. We will prove Theorem 1.8 only in the case where $p \in (0, 1/2)$ (i.e. $\kappa \in (4, 8)$), which corresponds to a limiting Brownian motion with strictly positive correlation. The version of Theorem 1.8 for $p = 0$ (i.e. $\kappa = 8$), in which case $D(\cdot)$ is a two-dimensional simple random walk and the limiting object is a pair of independent Brownian excursions, follows from basic scaling limit results for simple random walks. See [DW15b, Theorem 4] for a much more general statement.

We remark that there are several other results in the literature concerning scaling limits of random walks conditioned to stay in a cone (and possibly on their endpoint); see, e.g. [Shi91, Gar11, DW15a, DW15b]. Theorem 1.8 extends [DW15b, Theorem 4] to a certain non-Markovian random walk.

We will also obtain a finite-volume analogue of the main result of [GMS15]. To state this result, we need to recall some definitions from [GMS15].

Definition 1.9. A time t is called a *(weak) $\pi/2$-cone time* for a function $Z = (U, V) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ if there exists $t' < t$ such that $U_s \geq U_t$ and $V_s \geq V_t$ for $s \in [t', t]$. Equivalently, $Z([t', t])$ is contained in the "cone" $Z_t + \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \arg z \in [0, \pi/2]\}$. We write $v_Z(t)$ for the infimum of the times t' for which this condition is satisfied, i.e. $v_Z(t)$ is the entrance time of the cone. The *$\pi/2$-cone interval* corresponding to the time t is $[v_Z(t), t]$. We say that t is a *left (resp. right) $\pi/2$-cone time* if $V_t = V_{v_Z(t)}$ (resp. $U_t = U_{v_Z(t)}$). Two $\pi/2$-cone times for Z are said to be in the *same direction* if they are both left or both right $\pi/2$-cone times, and in the *opposite direction* otherwise. For a $\pi/2$-cone time t, we write $u_Z(t)$ for the supremum of the times $t^* < t$ such that

$$\inf_{s \in [t^*, t]} U_s < U_t \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{s \in [t^*, t]} V_s < V_t.$$

That is, $u_Z(t)$ is the last time before t that Z crosses the boundary line of the cone which it does not cross at time $v_Z(t)$.

If $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ is such that $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$, then i/n and $(i-1)/n$ are (weak) $\pi/2$-cone time for Z^n with $v_{Z^n}((i-1)/n) = \phi(i)/n$.

Definition 1.10. A $\pi/2$-cone time for Z is called a *maximal $\pi/2$-cone time* in an (open or closed) interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ if $[v_Z(t), t] \subset I$ and there is no $\pi/2$-cone time t' for Z such that $[v_Z(t'), t'] \subset I$ and $[v_Z(t), t] \subset (v_Z(t'), t')$. An integer $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ is called a *maximal flexible order time* in an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ if $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $\{\phi(i), \dots, i\} \subset I$, and there is no $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\phi(i') = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $\{\phi(i), \dots, i\} \subset \{\phi(i') + 1, \dots, i' - 1\}$, and $\{\phi(i'), \dots, i'\} \subset I$.

We can now state our second main result, which is an exact analogue of [GMS15, Theorem 1.9] in the setting where we condition on $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$.

Theorem 1.11. *Let $\dot{Z} = (\dot{U}, \dot{V})$ be a correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant during the time interval $[0, 2]$ and satisfy $\dot{Z}(2) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of $\pi/2$-cone times for $\dot{Z}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\dot{X}^n = \dot{X}^n_1 \dots \dot{X}^n_{2n}$ be sampled according to the law of the word $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$ conditioned on the event $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$ and let $\dot{Z}^n : [0, 2] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be the path (9) corresponding to $\dot{X}^n$. Let $\mathcal{I}_n$ be the set of $i \in [1, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $\dot{X}^n_i = \boxed{F}$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{T}_n = \{n^{-1}(i-1) : i \in \mathcal{I}_n\}$. Fix a countable dense set $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$. There is a coupling of the sequence $(\dot{X}^n)$ with the path $\dot{Z}$ such that the following holds a.s.*

1. *$\dot{Z}^n \to \dot{Z}$ uniformly.*
2. *$\mathcal{T}$ is precisely the set of limits of convergent sequences $(t_{n_j}) \in \mathcal{T}_{n_j}$ satisfying $\liminf_{j \to \infty}(t_{n_j} - v_{\dot{Z}^{n_j}}(t_{n_j})) > 0$ as (n_j) ranges over all strictly increasing sequences of positive integers.*
3. *For each sequence of times $t_{n_j} \in \mathcal{T}_{n_j}$ as in condition 2, we have $\lim_{j \to \infty} v_{\dot{Z}^{n_j}}(t_{n_j}) = v_{\dot{Z}}(t)$, $\lim_{j \to \infty} u_{\dot{Z}^{n_j}}(t_{n_j}) = u_{\dot{Z}}(t)$, and the direction of the $\pi/2$-cone time t_{n_j} is the same as the direction of t for sufficiently large j.*
4. *Suppose given an open interval $I \subset [0, 2]$ with endpoints in $\mathcal{Q}$ and $a \in I \cap \mathcal{Q}$. Let t be the maximal (Definition 1.10) $\pi/2$-cone time for $\dot{Z}$ in I with $a \in [v_{\dot{Z}}(t), t]$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let i_n be the maximal flexible order time (with respect to $\dot{X}^n$) i in nI with $an \in [\phi(i), i]$ (if such an i exists) and $i_n = \lfloor an \rfloor$ otherwise; and let $t_n = n^{-1} i_n$. Then a.s. $t_n \to t$.*
5. *For $a \in (0, 2)$ and $a \in (0, 2)$, let $\tau^{a,r}$ be the smallest $\pi/2$-cone time t for $\dot{Z}$ such that $t \geq a$ and $t - v_{\dot{Z}}(t) \geq r$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\iota^{a,r}_n$ be the smallest $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X^n_i = \boxed{F}$, $i \geq an$, and $i - \phi(i) \geq rn - 1$; and let $\tau^{a,r}_n = n^{-1} \iota^{a,r}_n$. We have $\tau^{a,r}_n \to \tau^{a,r}$ for each $(a, r) \in \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathcal{Q} \cap (0, \infty))$.*

Theorem 1.11 will turn out to be a straightforward consequence of our proof of Theorem 1.8 combined with [GMS15, Theorem 1.9].

The $\pi/2$-cone times of the correlated Brownian motion $\dot{Z}$ encode the CLE_κ loops on a γ-quantum sphere; whereas the times i for which $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$ encode the FK loops on the FK planar map $(M, \mathcal{L})$

(see [DMS14, GMS15, GM15b] for more details regarding this correspondence). Therefore, Theorems 1.8 and 1.11 together imply that many interesting functionals of the FK loops (e.g. the boundary lengths and areas of their complementary connected components and the adjacency graph on the set of loops) converge in the scaling limit to the corresponding functionals of the CLE_κ loops on a γ-quantum sphere. This answers [DMS14, Question 13.3] in the finite volume case.

1.3. **Outline.** In this subsection we will give an overview of the proofs of our main results and some motivation for our method. We will also describe the content of the remainder of this article.

Remark 1.12. Sections 2 through 6 can be read largely independently of each other. Only a few main results from each section are needed in subsequent sections, and these main results are stated near the beginning of each section.

In Section 2, we will describe how to make sense of Brownian motion conditioned on various zero-probability events. In particular, we will give a new construction of the limiting object in Theorem 1.8 (which was originally constructed in [MS15e, Section 3]) which gives an explicit formula for the law of the conditioned Brownian path at each time.

In the remainder of the paper, we turn our attention to the proofs of Theorems 1.8 and 1.11. See Figure 1 for an illustration of our argument.



FIGURE 1. An illustration of the proof of Theorems 1.8 and 1.11. The left figure shows that path D of (8) on the event $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$. The first step, accomplished in Section 3, is to prove the existence of a large interval $[\phi(\iota_0), \iota_0]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\iota_0 - \phi(\iota_0) \approx 2n - n^\xi$ for ξ slightly smaller than 1. The image of this interval under the path D is the left curve minus the two red segments. We then condition on the two red segments and consider the problem of showing convergence conditioned on the event that $X(1,2n)$ contains $l \asymp n^{\xi/2}$ cheeseburger orders and no other symbols (right figure). We analyze this situation by first growing the curve backward up to time $-(2n - \delta n)$ for fixed $\delta > 0$ (blue segment). Conditional on a realization of the blue curve, we continue until we get to a certain time j at distance of order n^ξ from $2n$, with the property that each coordinate of $D(X(-j,-1)$ lies at distance of order $n^{\xi/2}$ from the origin (green segment). Estimates for this segment of the curve are proven in Sections 4 and 5. Finally, we grow the purple segment of the curve until the path exits the first quadrant at l. We analyze this part of the curve using the results of [GS15] together with the regularity conditions on the event of Section 3.

The basic idea of the proofs of Theorems 1.8 and 1.11 is as follows. Let $\delta > 0$ be small but independent of n. Suppose we read the word X backward and we are given a realization x of $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1}$ for some $m \in [2n - \delta n, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that the reduced word $\mathcal{R}(x)$ contains no burgers. Let $\mathfrak{h}(x) = \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(\mathcal{R}(x))$ and $\mathfrak{c}(x) = \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(\mathcal{R}(x))$ be the number of hamburger orders and cheeseburger orders, respectively, in the reduced word corresponding to this realization, as in Definition 1.7. Ideally, we would like to establish the following (although we will actually prove something similar but more complicated).

- $\mathbb{P}\left(X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset \,|\, X_{-m} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)$ is bounded above by a constant times $n^{-1-\mu}$ times a slowly varying function of n, no matter how pathological the realization x is.
- For a typical realization x, $\mathbb{P}\left(X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset \,|\, X_{-m} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)$ is bounded below by a constant times $n^{-1-\mu}$ times this same slowly varying function of n.
- Conditional on $\{X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset\}$ and $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1} = x$, it is unlikely that $\sup_{i \in [m,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-j,-m-1)|$ is larger than $n^{1/2}$ times some quantity which tends to 0 as $\delta \to 0$.
- $\mathbb{P}\left(X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset \,|\, X_{-m} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)$ depends "continuously" on $(\mathfrak{h}(x), \mathfrak{c}(x))$, in the sense that
$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset \,|\, X_{-m} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset \,|\, X_{-m} \dots X_{-1} = x'\right)}$$
is close to 1 when $|\mathfrak{h}(x) - \mathfrak{h}(x')|$ and $|\mathfrak{c}(x) - \mathfrak{c}(x')|$ are bounded above by a small multiple of $n^{1/2}$.

Using Bayes rule and the above statements, one obtains that the conditional law of $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1}$ given $\{X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset\}$ is close to its conditional law given only that $X(-m,-1)$ contains no burgers; and that the path $Z^n(-\cdot)$ unlikely to move very much between times $n^{-1}m$ and 2 when we condition on $\{X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset\}$ and $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1} = x$. This allows us to compare the limit of the conditional law of Z^n given $\{X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset\}$ to the limit of the conditional law of Z^n given that $X(-2n,-1)$ contains no orders. This latter scaling limit is obtained in [GMS15, Theorem 4.1]. See [GS15] for a similar argument when we condition the tip of the path Z^n to be in the interior of the first quadrant, rather than at the origin; and [CC13, DW15b] for similar arguments in the case of random walks with iid increments.

In order to use the above approach, one requires "local estimates", i.e. estimates for the probability that the word $X(-2n,-m-1)$ contains a *particular* number of symbols of a given type, under various conditionings. Several such estimates are proven in [GS15], and we will expand on these estimates in this paper.

However, local estimates are not sufficient for our purposes, for the following reason. The event $\{X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset\}$ is not determined solely by the number of symbols of each type in $X(-2n,-m-1)$ and $X(-m,-1)$. Rather, due to the presence of $\boxed{\text{F}}$-symbols, this event depends in a complicated way on the precise ordering of the symbols in these two words. We know by [GMS15, Corollary 5.2] that with overwhelming probability, the number of $\boxed{\text{F}}$-symbols in $X(-m,-1)$ is of order at most $n^{1-\mu+o_n(1)} = o_n(n^{1/2})$. Nevertheless, fluctuations of order $n^{1-\mu+o_n(1)}$ due to these flexible orders can still effect whether $X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset$. Even inductive arguments as in [GS15, Section 5] produce estimates which are off by a factor of $n^{o_n(1)}$, which is not sufficiently precise for our purposes.

We are unable to address the combinatorics of how the words $X(-2n,-m-1)$ and $X(-m,-1)$ match up in the presence of $\boxed{\text{F}}$-symbols (indeed, we expect that it is not possible to do so in a sufficiently precise way for our purposes). Instead, we use various methods to avoid dealing with the matches of flexible orders directly.

In Section 3, we prove a proposition which reduces the problem of showing convergence conditioned on $\{X(-2n,-1) = \emptyset\}$ to the problem of showing convergence conditioned on the event that $X(-2n,-1)$ contains a specific number (say l) of cheeseburger orders, with $l \asymp n^{\xi/2}$ for ξ a little smaller than 1, and no other symbols; plus some further regularity conditions. This problem turns out to be more tractable than the original problem, since we can arrange that with high probability there is a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \asymp n^{\xi}$ with the property that all of the flexible orders in $X(-2n+k,-1)$ are matched to hamburgers in $X(-2n,-2n+k-1)$ (so we only need to estimate about the total number of symbols of each type in $X(-2n,-2n+k-1)$, not their ordering).

In order to reduce our problem in this manner, we will exploit a symmetry of finite-volume FK planar maps which does not have a straightforward description in terms of the hamburger-cheeseburger model. Namely, we will use that the law of a finite-volume rooted FK planar map is invariant under uniform re-rooting. For this argument we read the word X forward, rather than backward. The scaling limit results of [GMS15, GM15b] allow us to compare the local behavior of the FK loops on a finite-volume FK planar maps to the local behavior of CLE_κ loops on a γ-quantum cone when n is large. Using this, we will argue that if n is large and we condition on $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$, then with high probability the following is true. Let $(M, e_0, \mathcal{L})$ be the rooted FK planar map associated with $X_1, \dots, X_{2n}$. Also let $(Q, \mathbb{e}_0)$ be the associated quadrangulation as in [She11, Section 4.1]. Then times $i \in [1,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ correspond to edges $\lambda(i)$ of Q which are contained in a complementary connected component of some loop with area $\asymp n^\xi$ and boundary length $\asymp n^{\xi/2}$. By the explicit description of the loops of $\mathcal{L}$ in terms of the $\boxed{\mathrm{F}}$-symbols in the word $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$, if $i \in [1,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is such a time and we re-choose the root edge of e_0 of the FK planar map in such a way that $\lambda(i)$ becomes the root edge of Q, then there is a time $\iota_0^n \in [2n - n^\xi, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $X_{\iota_0^n} = \boxed{\mathrm{F}}$, $X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)} = \textcircled{\mathrm{H}}$, $\phi(\iota_0^n) \in [0, n^\xi]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and $|X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)| \asymp n^{\xi/2}$. By invariance of the rooted FK planar map $(M, e_0, \mathcal{L})$ under uniform rerooting, this shows that such a time ι_0^n exists with high probability when we condition on $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$. The restriction of Z^n to $[n^{-1}\phi(\iota_0^n), n^{-1}\iota_0^n]$ is likely to be close to Z^n itself, and the conditional law of $X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)} \dots X_{\iota_0^n}$ given $\phi(\iota_0^n)$, ι_0^n, and $|X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)|$ is the same as its conditional law given that $X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)$ contains exactly $|X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)|$ cheeseburger orders and no other symbols. This accomplishes the desired reduction.

In Section 4, we will establish the existence of a time $\widetilde{\pi}_n$ with the following properties. On the event of Section 3, each cheeseburger in $X(-J, -\widetilde{\pi}_n - 1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)$ (with J as in (10)); and, although $\widetilde{\pi}_n$ is not a stopping time for the word X, read backward, the conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n - 1}$ is "close" to the conditional law we would get if $\widetilde{\pi}_n$ were a stopping time. The time $\widetilde{\pi}_n$ corresponds to the last point of the green segment and the first point of the purple segment in Figure 1. The aforementioned properties of $\widetilde{\pi}_n$ will enable us to apply the estimates of [GS15] to the purple segment in Figure 1.

In Section 5, we will use the results of Section 4 together with the estimates of [GS15] to estimate the conditional probability that the path D exits the first quadrant at the marked point l in Figure 1 given a realization of the blue part of the path. These estimates will be used together with Bayes' rule to compare the conditional law of the blue part of the path in Figure 1 given the event depicted on the right side of the figure to its conditional law given only that it stays in the first quadrant until time m; this latter conditional law can in turn be estimated using [GMS15, Theorem 4.1]. Roughly speaking, we obtain that the former law is absolutely continuous with respect to the latter, with Radon-Nikodym derivative bounded independently of n and of $l \asymp n^{\xi/2}$; see Propositions 5.2 and 5.3 for precise statements.

In Section 6, we will combine the results of Sections 2, 3, and 5 to prove Theorems 1.8 and 1.11. The results of Sections 5 and 3 almost immediately imply tightness of the conditional laws of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$. Hence to prove Theorem 1.8 we just need to show that any subsequently limiting law is that of the path $\dot{Z}$ in Theorem 1.8.

The estimates of Section 5 are not quite enough for this purpose, as these estimates are off by constant factors, so can at best tell us that a subsequential limiting law is mutually absolutely continuous with respect to the law of $\dot{Z}$ when restricted to $[0,t]$ for $t < 2$. To get around this difficulty, we use an argument which is similar to the argument of the earlier sections of the paper, but with a small multiple of $n^{1/2}$ in place of $n^{\xi/2}$. Namely, we use the results of Sections 3 and 5 to show that with high conditional probability given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$, there is a "macroscopic $\boxed{\mathrm{F}}$-interval" in $[1,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying certain conditions, i.e., an $i \in [1,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $X_i = \boxed{\mathrm{F}}$, $X_{\phi(i)} = \textcircled{\mathrm{H}}$, $2n - i$ and $\phi(i)$ are small (but n-independent) multiples of $n^{1/2}$; $|X(\phi(i), i)|$ is a small (but n-independent) multiple of $n^{1/2}$; and several regularity conditions are satisfied. We then condition on $X_1 \dots X_{\phi(i)-1}$, $X_i \dots X_{2n}$, and $|X(\phi(i), i)|$ for such an i and show that, roughly speaking, the conditional law of the restriction of Z^n to $[\phi(i)/n, i/n]$ is close to what we expect it to be in the limit. This will yield Theorem 1.8. Our second main result

Theorem 1.11 is extracted in Section 6.5 from the same estimates used to prove Theorem 1.8 together with the results of [GMS15].

2. Conditioned Brownian motion

2.1. **Definitions and characterization lemmas.** In this section we will consider a correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion $Z = (U, V)$ as in (4) conditioned on various zero-probability events.

We start by considering the law of Z conditioned to stay in the first quadrant, which is also studied in [Shi85, GMS15]. In [Shi85, Theorem 2], Shimura proves, for each $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$, the existence of a probability measure on the space of continuous functions $[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ which is interpreted as the law of a standard two-dimensional Brownian motion (started from 0) conditioned to stay in the cone $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : 0 \le \arg z \le \theta\}$ for one unit of time. By applying an appropriate linear transformation to a path with this law, we obtain a random path $\widehat{Z}$ which we interpret as the correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion Z in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant for one unit of time. By scaling, one obtains the law of Z conditioned to stay in the first quadrant for a general $t > 0$ units of time. The following lemma, which is [GMS15, Lemma 2.1], uniquely characterizes the law of $\widehat{Z}$.

Lemma 2.1 ([GMS15]). *Let $\widehat{Z} = (\widehat{U}, \widehat{V}) : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be a random path distributed according to the conditional law of Z (started from 0) given that it stays in the first quadrant for one unit of time. Then $\widehat{Z}$ is a.s. continuous and satisfies the following conditions.*

1. *For each $t \in (0,1]$, a.s. $\widehat{U}(t) > 0$ and $\widehat{V}(t) > 0$.*
2. *For each $t \in (0,1)$, the regular conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[t,1]}$ given $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ is that of a Brownian motion with covariances as in (4), starting from $\widehat{Z}(t)$, parametrized by $[t,1]$, and conditioned on the (a.s. positive probability) event that it stays in the first quadrant.*

If $\widetilde{Z} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is another random a.s. continuous path satisfying the above two conditions, then $\widetilde{Z} \overset{d}{=} \widehat{Z}$.

We will also need to consider the law of the correlated Brownian motion Z of (4) (started from 0) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant for one unit of time and return to the origin at time 0. This law is described in [MS15e, Theorem 3.1], and (by that theorem) is uniquely characterized as follows.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\dot{Z} = (\dot{U}, \dot{V}) : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be sampled from the conditional law of $Z|_{[0,1]}$ (started from 0) given that it stays in the first quadrant and returns to 0 at time 1. Then $\dot{Z}$ is a.s. continuous and satisfies the following conditions.*

1. *For each $t \in [0,1]$, a.s. $\dot{U}(t) \neq 0$ and $\dot{V}(t) \neq 0$.*
2. *For each $0 < s < t < 1$, the regular conditional law of $\dot{Z}|_{[s,t]}$ given $\dot{Z}|_{[0,s]}$ and $\dot{Z}|_{[t,1]}$ is that of a Brownian bridge with covariances as in (4) from $\dot{Z}(s)$ to $\dot{Z}(t)$, parametrized by $[s,t]$, and conditioned on the (a.s. positive probability) event that it stays in the first quadrant.*

If $\ddot{Z} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is another random continuous path satisfying the above two conditions, then $\ddot{Z} \overset{d}{=} \dot{Z}$.

Lemma 2.2 is stated for the time interval $[0,1]$, but by Brownian scaling the analogous statement holds for $[0,T]$ for any fixed $T > 0$. In particular, for $T = 2$ we get the limiting law in Theorem 1.8. We note that Brownian motion conditioned to stay in a cone and return to the origin at time 1 (as well as more general conditioned Brownian motions) is also studied in [DW15a, DW15b] as a limit of conditioned random walks with iid increments.

2.2. **A more explicit construction of a correlated Brownian loop in the first quadrant.** In this subsection we will give an alternative construction of correlated Brownian motion $\dot{Z}$ conditioned to stay in the first quadrant for one unit of time and satisfy $\dot{Z}(1) = 0$. Our construction gives a stronger convergence statement and more information about the limiting law than the construction in [MS15e, Section 3].

To state our result, we need the following notation. Let $\widehat{Z} = (\widehat{U}, \widehat{V})$ be a random path with the law of Z started from 0 and conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time 1, as in Section 2.1.

For $t > 1$, let $\widehat{f}_t$ be the density with respect to Lebesgue measure of the law of $\widehat{Z}^t(t)$, where $\widehat{Z}^t$ is a correlated Brownian motion as in (4) started from 0 and conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time t. By [Shi85, Equation 3.2] and Brownian scaling,

$$\widehat{f}_t(z) = \frac{\det A}{2^\mu \Gamma(\mu) t^{1+\mu}} |Az|^{2\mu} e^{-|Az|^2/2t} \sin\left(2\mu \arg(Az)\right) \tag{13}$$

where

$$A := \sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{1-2p}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{p}{1-p} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-2p}}{1-p} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

so that $A\widehat{Z}$ is a standard two-dimensional Brownian (i.e. zero covariance and unit means) motion conditioned to stay in a cone. Note that our μ is equal to $1/2$ times the exponent μ of [Shi85].

The main result of this section is the following.

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose we are in the setting described just above. Fix $C > 1$ and for $\delta > 0$, let*

$$\mathcal{B}^\delta(C) := \left\{ \widehat{Z}(1) \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2} \right] \right\}. \tag{15}$$

1. *As $\delta \to 0$, the conditional laws of $\widehat{Z}$ given $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ converges weakly (with respect to the uniform topology) to the law of a correlated Brownian motion $\dot{Z}$ with covariance as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time 1 and satisfy $\dot{Z}(1) = 0$.*
2. *For each fixed $t \in (0,1)$, the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ converges in the strong topology to the law of $\dot{Z}|_{[0,1]}$ as $\delta \to 0$, in the sense that for each Borel measurable subset $\mathcal{U}$ of the set of paths $[0,t] \to \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]} \in \mathcal{U} \,|\, \mathcal{B}^\delta(C) \right) \to \mathbb{P}\left(\dot{Z}|_{[0,t]} \in \mathcal{U} \right). \tag{16}$$

3. *For each $t \in (0,1)$, the laws of $\dot{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ and $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ are mutually absolutely continuous, and the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the law of $\dot{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ with respect to the law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ is given by $g_t(\dot{Z}(t))$, where*

$$g_t(z) := \frac{c_t \widehat{f}_{1-t}(z)}{\mathbb{P}^z\left(Z([0,1-t]) \subset (0,\infty)^2 \right)} \tag{17}$$

with c_t a normalizing constant, $\widehat{f}_{1-t}(z)$ as in (13), and $\mathbb{P}^z$ the law of a correlated Brownian motion as in (4) started from z.

For the proof of Proposition 2.3, we use the following notation.

- For $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$, let $\mathbb{P}^z$ be as in the statement of Proposition 2.3 and let f_t^z be the density of $Z(t)$ under $\mathbb{P}^z$ (with respect to Lebesgue measure). Let $\mathbb{E}^z$ be the corresponding expectation.
- Let G_t be the event that Z stays in the first quadrant until time t.
- For $z, w \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathbb{P}_t^{z,w}$ be the law of a correlated two-dimensional Brownian bridge from z to w in time t, with covariance as in (4).
- For $t \in [0,1]$ let $\widehat{f}_t^1$ be the density of the unconditional law of $\widehat{Z}(t)$ with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Lemma 2.4. *Fix $C > 1$ and $t \in (0,1)$. For $\delta > 0$, let $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ be defined as in (15). For each bounded measurable function $\psi : (0,\infty)^2 \to (0,\infty)^2$, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathbb{E}\left(\psi(\widehat{Z}(t)) \,|\, \mathcal{B}^\delta(C) \right) = \frac{\int_{(0,\infty)^2} \psi(z) g_t(z) \widehat{f}_t^1(z)\, dz}{\int_{(0,\infty)^2} g_t(z) \widehat{f}_t^1(z)\, dz},$$

with g_t as in (17) and $\widehat{f}_t^1$ defined just above.

Proof. For the proof we use the notation introduced just above. For each $t \in (0,1)$, the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[t,1]}$ given $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ is $\mathbb{P}^{\widehat{Z}(t)}(\cdot \,|\, G_{1-t})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\psi(\widehat{Z}(t))\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)} \,|\, \widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}\right) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}^{\widehat{Z}(t)}\left(Z(1-t) \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2, G_{1-t}\right)\psi(\widehat{Z}(t))}{\mathbb{P}^{\widehat{Z}(t)}(G_{1-t})} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\widehat{Z}(t)}\left(\mathbb{P}^{\widehat{Z}(t)}(G_{1-t} \,|\, Z(1-t))\,\mathbb{1}_{\left(Z(1-t)\in\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2\right)}\right)\psi(Z(t))}{X_t(\widehat{Z}(t))} \qquad (18)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$X_t(z) := \mathbb{P}^z(G_{1-t}). \qquad (19)$$

For each $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the regular conditional law of $Z|_{[0,1-t]}$ given $Z(1-t)$ under $\mathbb{P}^z$ is $\mathbb{P}^{z,Z(1-t)}_{1-t}$. Furthermore, the density of the law of $Z(1-t)$ under $\mathbb{P}^z$ with respect to Lebesgue measure is given by f^z_{1-t}. Therefore, taking expectations in (18) yields

$$\int_{(0,\infty)^2}\int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2} \mathbb{P}^{z,w}_{1-t}(G_{1-t})\, f^z_{1-t}(w)\,\psi(z)\widehat{f}^1_t(z)X_t(z)^{-1}\,dw\,dz. \qquad (20)$$

By reversibility of Brownian bridge, we have $\mathbb{P}^{z,w}_{1-t}(G_{1-t}) = \mathbb{P}^{w,z}_{1-t}(G_{1-t})$. Furthermore, the Gaussian density $f^z_{1-t}(w)$ is symmetric in z and w. By combining these observations with Fubini's theorem, we see that (20) equals

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2}\int_{(0,\infty)^2} \mathbb{P}^{w,z}_{1-t}(G_{1-t})\, f^w_{1-t}(z)\,\psi(z)\widehat{f}^1_t(z)X_t(z)^{-1}\,dz\,dw \\ &\quad= \int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2} \mathbb{E}^w\left(\psi(Z(1-t))\widehat{f}^1_t(Z(1-t))X_t(Z(1-t))^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{G_{1-t}}\right)dw.\end{aligned}$$

For $w \in (0,\infty)^2$, let A be as in (14) and let

$$\Delta(w) := |Aw|^{2\mu}\sin(2\mu \arg Aw).$$

It is clear from [Shi85, Equation 3.2] (which gives an explicit formula for the density of $A\widehat{Z}(t)$) that $\widehat{f}^1_t(z)X_t(z)^{-1}$ is a bounded function of z. By [Shi85, Corollary to Lemma 4] and the discussion immediately thereafter, for $w \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}^w\left(\psi(Z(1-t))\widehat{f}^1_t(Z(1-t))X_t(Z(1-t))^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{G_{1-t}}\right) = a_0\Delta(w)\left(\int_{(0,\infty)^2}\psi(z)\widehat{f}^1_t(z)X_t(z)^{-1}\widehat{f}_{1-t}(z)\,dz + o_\delta(1)\right)$$

where a_0 is a finite positive constant depending only on p and the $o_\delta(1)$ depends only on C, t_0, and ψ (and in particular is uniform for $w \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2$). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\psi(\widetilde{Z}(t))\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)}\right) &= a_0\int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2}\int_{(0,\infty)^2}\Delta(w)\psi(z)\widehat{f}^1_t(z)X_t(z)^{-1}\widehat{f}_{1-t}(z)\,dz\,dw + o_\delta(\delta^{1+\mu}) \\ &= a_0\left(\int_{(0,\infty)^2}\psi(z)\widehat{f}^1_t(z)g_t(z)\,dz\right)\left(\int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2}\Delta(w)\,dw\right) + o_\delta(\delta^{1+\mu}). \qquad (21)\end{aligned}$$

In particular, by taking $\psi \equiv 1$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)\right) = a_0\left(\int_{(0,\infty)^2}\widehat{f}^1_t(z)g_t(z)\,dz\right)\left(\int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2}\Delta(w)\,dw\right) + o_\delta(\delta^{1+\mu}). \qquad (22)$$

By combining (21) and (22), we obtain the statement of the lemma. □

Lemma 2.5. *Fix $C > 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$. There exists $t_\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\delta_\epsilon > 0$, depending only on C and ϵ, such that for $\delta \in (0, \delta_\epsilon]$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [t_\epsilon, 1]} |\widehat{Z}(t)| \leq \epsilon \,|\, \mathcal{B}^\delta(C) \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Proof. For $\epsilon > 0$ and $t \in (0,1)$, let

$$F^\epsilon_{1-t} := \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, 1-t]} |Z(s)| > \epsilon \right\}.$$

By a similar argument to the one leading to (20) of Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [t,1]} |\widehat{Z}(t)| > \epsilon,\, \mathcal{B}^\delta(C) \right) &= \int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2} \mathbb{E}^w \left(\widehat{f}^1_t(Z(1-t)) X_t(z)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{F^\epsilon_{1-t} \cap G_{1-t}} \right) dw \\ &= \int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2} \mathbb{E}^w \left(\widehat{f}^1_t(Z(1-t)) X_t(z)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{F^\epsilon_{1-t}} \,|\, G_{1-t} \right) \mathbb{P}^w\left(G_{1-t}\right) dw. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

with $X_t(z)$ as in (19). Furthermore, by (20) with $\psi \equiv 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)\right) = \int_{\left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2} \mathbb{E}^w \left(\widehat{f}^1_t(Z(1-t)) \,|\, G_{1-t} \right) \mathbb{P}^w\left(G_{1-t}\right) dw. \tag{24}$$

By [Shi85, Theorem 2], for each fixed $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^w \left(\widehat{f}^1_t(Z(1-t)) X_t(z)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{F^\epsilon_{1-t}} \,|\, G_{1-t} \right) &\to \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}^1_t(\widehat{Z}(1-t)) X_t(z)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{F^\epsilon_{1-t}} \right) \\ \mathbb{E}^w \left(\widehat{f}^1_t(Z(1-t)) X_t(z)^{-1} \,|\, G_{1-t} \right) &\to \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}^1_t(\widehat{Z}(1-t)) X_t(z)^{-1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

as $\delta \to 0$, uniformly over all $w \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2$. By continuity of $\widehat{Z}$, it follows that for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$, there exists $t_\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\delta_\epsilon > 0$, depending only on C, ϵ, and α such that for $\delta \in (0, \delta_\epsilon]$ and $w \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^w \left(\widehat{f}^1_{t_\epsilon}(Z(1-t_\epsilon)) X_{t_\epsilon}(z)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{F^\epsilon_{1-t_\epsilon}} \,|\, G_{1-t_\epsilon} \right) \leq \alpha \mathbb{E}^w \left(\widehat{f}^1_t(Z(1-t_\epsilon)) \,|\, G_{1-t_\epsilon} \right). \tag{25}$$

By [Shi85, Equation 4.2] and scale invariance, for $w \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}^w\left(G_{1-t_\epsilon}\right) \asymp (1-t_\epsilon)^{-\mu} \delta^\mu,$$

with the implicit constant depending only on C. It therefore follows from (23), (24), and (25) that for $\delta \in (0, \delta_\epsilon]$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [t_\epsilon, 1]} |\widehat{Z}(t)| > \epsilon \,|\, \mathcal{B}^\delta(C) \right) \preceq \alpha$$

with the implicit constant depending only on C. We now conclude by choosing α smaller than ϵ divided by this implicit constant. □

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be as in the statement of the proposition. For $z \in (0,\infty)^2$, the regular conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\{\widehat{Z}(t) = z\}$ and the event $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ is that of a correlated Brownian motion as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant for t units of time and end up at z (see [GS15] for a definition of this object). By [GS15, Lemma 1.11] and Lemma 2.2, the same is true of the conditional law of $\dot{Z}$ given $\{\dot{Z}(t) = z\}$. Therefore, if $\delta < 1 - t$ then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]} \in \mathcal{U} \,|\, \widehat{Z}(t) = z,\, \mathcal{B}^\delta(C) \right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\dot{Z}|_{[0,t]} \in \mathcal{U} \,|\, \dot{Z}(t) = z \right).$$

Call this quantity $\psi(z)$. By Lemma 2.4 applied with this choice of ψ, it follows that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]} \in \mathcal{U} \,|\, \mathcal{B}^\delta(C)\right) = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \mathbb{E}\left(\psi(\widehat{Z}(t)) \,|\, \mathcal{B}^\delta(C)\right) = \frac{\int_{(0,\infty)^2} \psi(z) g_t(z) \widehat{f}_t^1(z)\, dz}{\int_{(0,\infty)^2} g_t(z) \widehat{f}_t^1(z)\, dz}. \tag{26}$$

By (26), Lemma 2.5, and the Arzéla-Ascoli theorem, the family of conditional laws of $\widehat{Z}$ given $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ for $\delta \in (0,1)$ is tight. Let $\ddot{Z}$ be discributed according to any weak subsequential limit of these laws. By (26), for each $t \in (0,1)$, the law of $\ddot{Z}|_{[0,1]}$ is obtained by re-weighting the unconditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ by $g_t(\ddot{Z}(t))$. Since this reweighting depends only on $\widehat{Z}(t)$, it follows that for each such t and a.e. $z \in (0,\infty)^2$, the regular conditional law of $\ddot{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\{\ddot{Z}(t) = z\}$ is the same as the regular conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\{\widehat{Z}(t) = z\}$. By condition 2 of Lemma 2.1, for each $s \in (0,t)$, the regular conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[s,t]}$ given $\widehat{Z}(s)$ and $\widehat{Z}(t)$ is that of a Brownian bridge from $\widehat{Z}(s)$ to $\widehat{Z}(t)$ conditioned to stay in the first quadrant. Therefore the same is true for $\ddot{Z}$. In other words, $\ddot{Z}$ satisfies condition 2 of Lemma 2.2. It is clear from (26) that condition 1 of the same lemma is also satisfied. Thus $\ddot{Z} \overset{d}{=} \dot{Z}$. This proves the first assertion of the proposition. The other two assertions are clear from (26). □

Remark 2.6. For $\delta > 0$, let $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ be a correlated Brownian motion as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant for $1-\delta$ units of time, so that $\widehat{Z}^\delta|_{[1-\delta,1]}$ evolves as a Brownian motion as in (4) with no conditioning. Also let

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C) := \left\{\widehat{Z}^\delta(1-\delta) \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]\right\}. \tag{27}$$

Essentially the same argument used to prove Proposition 2.3 shows that the statement of the proposition remains true if we substitute $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ for $\widehat{Z}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)$ for $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$. This fact will be used in Section 6.3 below.

3. Existence of a large loop

3.1. **Statement and relationships between events.** In this section we will prove a proposition which will eventually allow us to reduce the proof of Theorem 1.8 to a convergence statement for the path Z^n conditioned on the event that $X(1,n)$ contains a particular number $l \asymp n^{\xi/2}$ of hamburger orders and no other symbols (plus some regularity conditions.

Throughout this section we will use the following notation. Fix $\xi \in (0,1)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$, let $\iota_0^n = \iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)$ be the largest $i \in [1,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which the following holds.

1. $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and $X_{\phi(i)} = \text{Ⓗ}$.
2. $2n - n^\xi \le i - \phi(i) \le 2n - \epsilon_0 n^\xi$.
3. $\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2} \le |X(\phi(i), i)| \le \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}$.
4. The smallest $i \in [\iota_0^n + 1, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and $\phi(i) < \phi(\iota_0^n)$ (equivalently $\phi(i) < \iota_0^n$) satisfies $X_{\phi(i)} = \text{Ⓒ}$.

If no such i exists, we set $\iota_0^n = 0$.

Also let $\iota_1^n = \iota_1^n(\epsilon_0)$ be the largest $i \in [\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $X_{\phi(i)} = \text{Ⓒ}$, and $i - \phi(i) \ge \frac{1}{2}(\iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n))$. We set $\iota_1^n = 0$ if no such i exists.

Remark 3.1. If $\iota_0^n > 0$, $\iota_1^n < \iota_0^n$, and $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$, then under the bijection of [She11, Section 4.1], $X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)} \dots X_{\iota_0^n}$ corresponds to the largest complementary connected component of a certain loop in the FK planar map corresponding to $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$; and $X_{\phi(\iota_1^n)} \dots X_{\iota_1^n}$ corresponds to a complementary connected component of one of the outermost loops contained in this complementary connected component. See also [GM15b].

The main result of this section is the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *For $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$, let $\mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{G}_n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ be the event that $\iota_0^n = \iota_0^n(\epsilon_0) > 0$, $\iota_1^n = \iota_1^n(\epsilon_0) > 0$, $X(1,2n) = \emptyset$, and the following additional conditions hold.*

(1) $\iota_1^n - \phi(\iota_1^n) \ge \iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n) - \epsilon_1^{-1}(\iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n))^\xi$.

(2) $|X(\phi(\iota_1^n), \iota_1^n)| \geq \epsilon_1 \left(\iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n)\right)^{\xi/2}$.

For each $q \in (0,1)$*, there exists* $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ *and* $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for* $n \geq n_*$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{G}_n \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

The reason for introducing the times ι_0^n and ι_1^n is that conditioning on $\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n$, and $|X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)|$ will allow us to reduce the problem of studying the conditional law of $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$ given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$ to the more tractable problem of studying its conditional law given the following event.

Definition 3.3. Let J be the smallest $j \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $X(-j,-1)$ contains a burger. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_n^l$ be the event that $J = n$, $X_{-J} = \textcircled{H}$, and $X(-n,-1)$ contains exactly one hamburger, l cheeseburger orders, and no other symbols. For $\epsilon_1 > 0$, let $\mathcal{E}_n^l = \mathcal{E}_n^l(\epsilon_1)$ be the event that $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_n^l$ occurs and there exists $j \in [1, J]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that the following conditions hold.

(1) $j \geq n - \epsilon_1^{-1} n^{\xi}$.
(2) There are at least $\epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$ hamburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $X(-j,-1)$.
(3) Each cheeseburger in $X(-J,-j-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-j,-1)$.

Let $\pi_n = \pi_n(\epsilon)$ be the smallest $j \in [1,J]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying the above conditions (if it exists) and otherwise let $\pi_n := J$.

Remark 3.4. The time π_n of Definition 3.3 is *not* a stopping time for the word X, read backward. Rather, for any realization x of $X_{-\pi_n} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\pi_n < J$, the conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-|x|}$ given $\{X_{-\pi_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ is the same as its conditional given $\{X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ and the additional event that each cheeseburger in $X(-J,-|x|-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-|x|,-1)$.

Lemma 3.5. *Fix* $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$*. Let* $\iota_0^n = \iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)$ *and* $\iota_1^n = \iota_1^n(\epsilon_1)$ *be defined as above and let* $\mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{G}_n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ *be the event of Proposition 3.2. Also let* $\mathcal{G}_n' = \mathcal{G}_n'(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ *be the event that* $\iota_0^n > 0$*,* $X(1,2n) = \emptyset$*, and there exists* $i \in [\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ *such that the following conditions hold:*

(1) $i \leq \phi(\iota_0^n) + \epsilon_1^{-1} \left(\iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n)\right)^{\xi}$.
(2) There are at least $\epsilon_1 \left(\iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n)\right)^{\xi/2}$ *hamburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in* $X(i, \iota_0^n)$.
(3) Each cheeseburger in $X(\phi(\iota_0^n), i-1)$ *is matched to a cheeseburger order in* $X(i, \iota_0^n)$.

Then $\mathcal{G}_n \subset \mathcal{G}_n'$*, so for each* $q \in (0,1)$*, there exists* $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ *and* $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for* $n \geq n_*$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{G}_n' \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Proof. Observe that if $\mathcal{G}_n$ occurs, then the conditions for the time i in the definition of $\mathcal{G}_n'$ are satisfied with $i = \phi(\iota_1^n)$. Indeed, the conditions 1 and 2 in the definition of $\mathcal{G}_n$ imply the conditions 1 and 2 in the definition of $\mathcal{G}_n'$. The condition 3 follows from maximality of ι_1^n and the fact that $X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)$ contains no cheeseburgers. □

The reason for our interest in the event $\mathcal{G}_n'$ of Lemma 3.5 is as follows.

Lemma 3.6. *Let* $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$*. Let* $\iota_0^n = \iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)$ *be as in the beginning of this subsection and let* $\mathcal{G}_n' = \mathcal{G}_n'(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ *be the event of Lemma 3.5. Suppose given realizations* x *of* $X_1 \dots X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)-1}$*,* x' *of* $X_{\iota_n} \dots X_{2n}$*, and* l *of* $|X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)|$ *for which*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 \dots X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)-1} = x,\, X_{\iota_n} \dots X_{2n} = x',\, |X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)| = l,\, \mathcal{G}_n'\right) > 0.$$

Let $m := 2n - |x'| - |x| - 1$*. The conditional law of* $X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)} \dots X_{\iota_0^n - 1}$ *given*

$$\{X_1 \dots X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)-1} = x,\, X_{\iota_n} \dots X_{2n} = x',\, |X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)| = l,\, \mathcal{G}_n'\}$$

is the same as the conditional law of the word $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1}$ *given the event* $\mathcal{E}_m^l = \mathcal{E}_m^l(\epsilon_1)$ *of Definition 3.3.*

Proof. Fix x, x', and l as in the statement of the lemma. Also let $n_1 := |x| + 1$ and $n_2 := 2n - |x'|$ be the corresponding realizations of $\phi(\iota_0^n)$ and ι_0^n, respectively. We first argue that the conditional law of $X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)} \dots X_{\iota_0^n - 1}$ given

$$\{X_1 \dots X_{\phi(\iota_0^n)-1} = x,\, X_{\iota_n} \dots X_{2n} = x',\, |X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)| = l,\, X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\} \tag{28}$$

is the same as the conditional law of $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1}$ given the event $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_n^l$ of Definition 3.3.

To see this, we first observe that the event (28) is equal to the intersection of the following events:

$$E_1 := \left\{ X_{n_1} = \text{Ⓗ},\, \phi(n_1) = n_2, \text{ and } X(n_1, n_2 - 1) \text{ contains one Ⓗ, } l \boxed{\text{C}}\text{'s, and no other symbols} \right\}$$
$$E_2 := \{X_1 \dots X_{n_1 - 1} = x,\, X_{n_2} \dots X_{2n} = x'\}$$
$$E_3 := \{\text{There is no } i \in [n_2 + 1, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ satisfying the defining conditions of } \iota_0^n\}$$
$$E_4 := \left\{ \text{The smallest } i \in [n_2 + 1, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ with } X_i = \boxed{\text{F}} \text{ and } \phi(i) < n_2 \text{ satisfies } X_{\phi(i)} = \text{Ⓒ}. \right\}$$
$$E_5 := \{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}.$$

The events E_1 and E_2 are independent. The event $E_3 \cap E_4 \cap E_5$ depends only on $X(n_1, n_2 - 1)$, $X_{n_2+1} \dots X_{2n}$, and $X_1 \dots X_{n_1 - 1}$, so by our choice of x, x', and l, this event always occurs when $E_1 \cap E_2$ occurs. It follows that the conditional law of the word $X_{n_1} \dots X_{n_2 - 1}$ given the event (28) is the same as its conditional law given E_1, which by translation invariance is the same as the conditional law of $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1}$ given $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_m^l$.

It is clear from the definitions of $\mathcal{G}_n'$ and $\mathcal{E}_m^l$ that if we further condition on $\mathcal{G}_n'$, the the conditional law of $X_{n_1} \dots X_{n_2 - 1}$ under this conditioning is the same as the conditional law of $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1}$ given $\mathcal{E}_m^l$. □

3.2. **Defining events in terms of the FK planar map.** On the event $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$, let $(M^n, e_0^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ be the rooted FK planar map associated with $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$ via Sheffield's bijection. Let $(Q^n, \mathbb{e}_0^n)$ be the quadrangulation associated with M^n as in [She11, Section 4.1], i.e. the set of vertices of Q^n is the union of the set of vertices of M^n and the set of faces of M^n; two vertices of Q^n are joined by an edge if and only if these two vertices correspond to a face of M^n and a vertex adjacent to this face; and $\mathbb{e}_0^n$ is the unique edge of Q^n whose primal endpoint is adjacent to e_0^n and which is the first edge counterclockwise from e_0^n with this property. Note that Q^n has $2n$ edges.

The idea of the proof of Proposition 3.2 is as follows. We will define events $A_i^n = A_i^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ for $i \in [1, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ (which depend only on the "local" behavior of the word near time i) and show that, roughly speaking, the following holds.

1. If ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 are small, then with high probability, A_i^n occurs for most $i \in [1, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, even if we condition on $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$.
2. If A_i^n occurs, $X(1, 2n) = \emptyset$, and we choose a new root edge for the FK planar map in such a way that the ith edge hit by the exploration path in Sheffield's bijection becomes the root edge of Q^n, then $\mathcal{G}_n$ occurs for the word corresponding to the re-rooted map.

The statement of the proposition will follow from this together with invariance of the law of $(M^n, e_0^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ under uniform re-rooting (see Lemma 3.11 below). The operation of choosing a new root edge does not have a nice description in terms of the word $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$ (indeed, we are not aware of a simple criterion to determine whether two words x and x' consisting of elements of Θ which have the same length and both reduce to the empty word correspond under Sheffield's bijection to the same FK planar map with two different choices of root edge). Hence to exploit re-rooting invariance of $(M^n, e_0^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ we need to study FK loops rather than burgers and orders.

In the remainder of this subsection we will construct events $\widetilde{A}_i^n$ which will eventually be used to define the events A_i^n after we zoom in on an interval of length n^ξ. We will define these events in terms of the infinite-volume rooted FK planar map associated with the bi-infinite word X, which we denote by $(M^\infty, e_0^\infty, \mathcal{L}^\infty)$. This FK planar map can be obtained from the word X via essentially the same bijection described in [She11, Section 4.1]. See [BLR15, Che15] for more details regarding the infinite-volume version of this bijection.

Let $(Q^\infty, \mathbb{e}_0^\infty)$ be the associated rooted quadrangulation (defined in the same manner as the rooted quadrangulation $(Q^n, \mathbb{e}_0^n)$ at the beginning of this subsection but with (M^∞, e_0^∞) in place of (M^n, e_0^n)). Let λ be the path which explores $(Q^\infty, \mathbb{e}_0^\infty)$, i.e. $\lambda(i)$ is the edge of Q^∞ corresponding to the symbol $X_i \in \Theta$ under Sheffield's bijection.

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\{\ell_{i,j}\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the ordered sequence of loops in $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ which surround $\lambda(i)$, so that each $\ell_{i,j}$ is a cyclically ordered set of edges in Q^∞ and $\ell_{i,j+1}$ disconnects $\ell_{i,j}$ from ∞ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

We want to consider complementary connected components of the loops $\ell_{i,j}$, which we define as follows. For the definition we let S and S^* be the primal and dual FK edge sets for the map M^∞.

Definition 3.7. Let $\ell \in \mathcal{L}^\infty$ be an FK loop. Let A and A^* be the clusters of edges in S and S^* which are separated by ℓ (so that A and A^* are connected). A *primal (resp. dual) complementary connected component* of ℓ is a set of edges $U \subset Q^\infty$ such that the following is true. There exists a simple cycle C of S (resp. S^*) which is contained in A (resp. A^*) such that U is the set of edges of Q^∞ disconnected from ℓ by C; and there is no set U' of edges of Q^∞ satisfying the above property and properly containing U. In this case we write $C = \partial U$.

Definition 3.8. Suppose U is a complementary connected component of a loop in $\mathcal{L}^\infty$. We write $\operatorname{Area} U$ for the number of edges in U and $\operatorname{len} \partial U$ for the number of edges in ∂U.

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $M_{i,j}^0$ (resp. $M_{i,j}^\infty$) be the set of edges in Q^∞ which belong to the same complementary connected component of the loop $\ell_{i,j}$ as $\lambda(i)$ (resp. the set of edges in Q^∞ which are disconnected from ∞ by $\ell_{i,j}$). See Figure 2 for an illustration.



FIGURE 2. An illustration of two consecutive loops surrounding $\lambda(i)$ in the infinite-volume rooted FK planar map $(M^\infty, e_0^\infty, \mathcal{L}^\infty)$ together with the components $M_{i,j}^0$ and $M_{i,j+1}^0$ containing $\lambda(i)$ and the complements $M_{i,j}^\infty$ and $M_{i,j+1}^\infty$ of the unbounded components. The boundaries of $M_{i,j+1}^0$ and $M_{i,j}^\infty$ (resp. $M_{i,j}^0$ and $M_{i,j+1}^\infty$) are either both formed by edges of S or both formed by edges of S^*, so these pairs of boundaries are shown in the same color.

Let $\widetilde{\theta}_{i,j}$ (resp. $\theta_{i,j}$) be the time at which λ starts (resp. finishes) tracing $\ell_{i,j}$, so that $[\widetilde{\theta}_{i,j}, \theta_{i,j} - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the intersection of $\mathbb{Z}$ with the smallest interval which contains the set of $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\lambda(k) \in \ell_{i,j}$. It follows from the construction in [She11, Section 4.1] that $X_{\theta_{i,j}} = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and $\phi(\theta_{i,j}) = \widetilde{\theta}_{i,j}$.

Fix $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in [1,n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, let $J_i^n(\epsilon_0)$ be the smallest $j \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $\ell_{i,j}$ is traced by λ in the counterclockwise direction (equivalently $X_{\theta_{i,j}} = \textcircled{H}$),

$$\operatorname{Area} M_{i,j}^{\infty} \geq \epsilon_0 n, \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_0 n^{1/2} \leq \operatorname{len} \partial M_{i,j}^{\infty} \leq \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{1/2}.$$

Here we use the notation of Definition 3.8. Set $J_i^n(\epsilon_0) = 0$ if no such j exists. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\theta}_i^n &:= \theta_{i,J_i^n(\epsilon_0)}, \quad \underline{M}_i^n := M_{i,J_i^n(\epsilon_0)}^{\infty}, \quad \underline{\ell}_i^n := \ell_{i,J_i^n(\epsilon_0)} \\ \overline{\theta}_i^n &:= \theta_{i,J_i^n(\epsilon_0)+1}, \quad \overline{M}_i^n := M_{i,J_i^n(\epsilon_0)+1}^{\infty}, \quad \overline{\ell}_i^n := \ell_{i,J_i^n(\epsilon_0)+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where here we use the convention that $\theta_{i,0} = i$ and $M_{i,0}^{\infty} = \ell_{i,0} = \emptyset$. Then $\underline{\ell}_i^n$ is the innermost counterclockwise loop surrounding $\lambda(i)$ with area at least $\epsilon_0 n$ and outer boundary length between $\epsilon_0 n^{1/2}$ and $\epsilon_0^{-1} n^{1/2}$; and $\overline{\ell}_i^n$ is the loop immediately outside $\underline{\ell}_i^n$.

Let $\widetilde{A}_i^n = \widetilde{A}_i^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ be the event that the following is true.

(1) $J_i^n(\epsilon_0) > 0$.
(2) $\operatorname{len}\left(\partial \overline{M}_i^n\right) \geq \epsilon_1 n^{1/2}$.
(3) $\operatorname{Area} \overline{M}_i^n \leq \epsilon_1^{-1} \operatorname{Area} \underline{M}_i^n$.
(4) $[\phi(\overline{\theta}_i^n), \overline{\theta}_i^n]_{\mathbb{Z}} \subset [1,n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

3.3. **Proof of Proposition 3.2.** In this subsection we will prove Proposition 3.2 conditional on a technical lemma which we state below, and prove in Section 3.4. Throughout, we continue to use the notation introduced in the preceding two subsections.

Lemma 3.9. *Define the events $\widetilde{A}_i^n = \widetilde{A}_i^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ as in Section 3.2. For each $i \in [1,n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the event $\widetilde{A}_i^n$ is measurable with respect to $X_1 \dots X_n$. Furthermore, for each $q \in (0,1)$, there exists $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$, such that the following is true. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widetilde{S}^n = \widetilde{S}^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ be the set of $i \in [1,n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which $\widetilde{A}_i^n$ occurs. For each $n \geq n_*$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\#\widetilde{S}^n \geq (1-q)n\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Lemma 3.9 will be proven in Section 3.4 below using the infinite-volume version of the results in [GM15b] (c.f. Remark 1.1). In the remainder of this subsection, we assume Lemma 3.9 and use it to prove Proposition 3.2.

By [GS15, Theorem 1.10], $\mathbb{P}\left(X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right)$ decays slower than some negative power of n. Hence to transfer the statement of Lemma 3.9 to a statement about conditional probabilities $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$, it suffices to produce an event whose probability decays faster than any power of n. We accomplish this by dividing $[1,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ into many intervals of length $\asymp n^{1-\xi}$ for fixed $\xi \in (0,1)$ and independently applying Lemma 3.9 in each interval.

Lemma 3.10. *Fix $\xi \in (0,1)$, $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let*

$$I_n^k := \left[(k-1)n^{\xi} + 1, kn^{\xi}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}. \tag{30}$$

For $i \in [0,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ let k be chosen so that $i \in I_n^k$ and let $A_i^n = A_i^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ be defined in the same manner as the event $\widetilde{A}_i^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ as above but with n^{ξ} in place of n and I_n^k in place of $[1,n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Let $S^n = S^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ be the set of $i \in [1, 2n - n^{\xi}]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which A_i^n occurs. For each $q \in (0,1)$, there exists $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\#S^n \geq (2-q)n\right) = 1 - o_n^{\infty}(n).$$

Proof. By the first assertion of Lemma 3.9, the random variables $\#(I_n^k \cap S^n)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are iid. By Lemma 3.9, for any $\alpha > 0$, we can find $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq \widetilde{n}_*$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\#(S^n \cap I_n^k) \geq (1-\alpha)n^{\xi}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

By Hoeffding's inequality for Bernoulli sums, except on an event of probability $o_n^{\infty}(n)$, the number of $k \in [1, 2n^{1-\xi}]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which $\#(I_n^k \cap S^n) \geq (1-\alpha)n^{\xi}$ is at least $1 - 2\alpha$. If this is the case, then $\#S^n \geq 2(1-\alpha)(1-2\alpha+o_n(1))n$. We conclude by choosing α small enough that $2(1-\alpha)(1-2\alpha) > 2-q$ and n sufficiently large. □

Before we can prove Proposition 3.2, we first need the following elementary observation about the bijection of [She11].

Lemma 3.11. *Let $(M^n, e_0^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ be a rooted FK planar map with n edges and let $(Q^n, \mathbb{e}_0^n)$ be the rooted quadrangulation associated with $(M^n, e_0^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ as described in the beginning of Section 3.2. The conditional law of $\mathbb{e}_0^n$ given $(M^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ is given by the uniform measure on the $2n$ edges of Q^n.*

Proof. As explained in [She11, Section 4.2], the law of the triple $(M^n, e_0^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ conditioned on $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$ is equal to the uniform distribution on such triples for which M^n has n edges weighted by $q^{\#\mathcal{L}}$, where $q = 4p^2/(2p-1)^2$. In particular, this weighting does not depend on e_0^n, so the conditional law given $(M^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ of the oriented root edge e_0^n of M^n is uniform over all $2n$ choices of oriented edges in M^n. Each choice of root edge e_0^n for M^n determines a unique root edge $\mathbb{e}_0^n$ for Q^n, namely the edge of Q^n whose primal endpoint is the initial endpoint of $\mathbb{e}_0^n$ and which is the next edge clockwise from $\mathbb{e}_0^n$ among all edges of M^n and Q^n that start at that endpoint; conversely, each edge of Q^n arises from a unique edge of M^n in this manner. The statement of the lemma follows. □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. On the event $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$, let $(M^n, e_0^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ be the rooted FK planar map associated with the word $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$and let $(Q^n, \mathbb{e}_0^n)$ be the rooted quadrangulation constructed from M, as described at the beginning of Section 3.2. Let λ^n be the discrete exploration path which traces the edges of the quadrangulation Q^n; i.e. for $i \in [1,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, $\lambda^n(i)$ is the ith edge of Q^n visited by the exploration path (called e_i in [She11]); and $\lambda^n(0) = \lambda^n(2n) := \mathbb{e}_0^n$ is the root edge of Q^n.

Given $q \in (0,1)$, let $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ be chosen so that the conclusion of Lemma 3.10 is satisfied. For $i \in [1, 2n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ let $A_i^n = A_i^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ and $S^n = S^n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ be defined as in that lemma. By [GS15, Theorem 1.10], $\mathbb{P}\left(X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) \geq n^{-1-2\mu+o_n(1)}$, with μ as in (12). It therefore follows from Lemma 3.10 that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\#S^n \geq (2-q)n \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) = 1 - o_n^\infty(n).$$

For $i \in [1,2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that A_i^n occurs, let I_n^k be the interval as in (30) which contains i. Let $\underline{\ell}_i^n$ and $\overline{\ell}_i^n$ be the loops in $\mathcal{L}^n$ surrounding $\lambda^n(i)$ and contained in $\lambda^n(I_n^k)$ as in Section 3.2 but with I_n^k in place of $[1,n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and the finite-volume bijection used in place of the infinite-volume one. Also define $\underline{M}_i^n$ and $\overline{M}_i^n$ as in that section. For $i \in [1, 2n - n^\xi]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, on the event A_i^n we have the following.

(1) $\underline{\ell}_i^n$ is a counterclockwise loop, $\overline{\ell}_i^n$ is a clockwise loop which disconnects $\underline{\ell}_i^n$ from the root edge, and there is no loop in $\mathcal{L}^n$ surrounding i which is disconnects $\underline{\ell}_i^n$ from $\overline{\ell}_i^n$.
(2) $\epsilon_0 n^\xi \leq \operatorname{Area} \underline{M}_i^n \leq n^\xi$.
(3) $\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2} \leq \operatorname{len}\left(\partial \underline{M}_i^n\right) \leq \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}$.
(4) $\operatorname{Area} \overline{M}_i^n \leq \epsilon_1^{-1} \operatorname{Area} \underline{M}_i^n$.
(5) $\operatorname{len}\left(\partial \overline{M}_i^n\right) \geq \epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$.
(6) There is no counterclockwise loop disconnected from the root edge by by $\overline{\ell}_i^n$ such that the set of points disconnected from the root edge by this loop has area at least $\epsilon_0 n^\xi$ and boundary length between $\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}$ and $\epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}$.

For $i \in [1, 2n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, let $\widehat{A}_i^n$ be the event that there exist loops $\underline{\ell}_i^n$ and $\overline{\ell}_i^n$ in $\mathcal{L}^n$ surrounding $\lambda^n(i)$ such that the above five conditions hold. Let $\widehat{S}^n$ be the set of $i \in [1, 2n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $\widehat{A}_i^n$ occurs. Then $S^n \subset \widehat{S}^n$, so

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\#\widehat{S}^n \geq (2-q)n \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) = 1 - o_n^\infty(n). \tag{31}$$

If $\widehat{A}_i^n$ occurs and we re-root the quadrangulation Q^n so that $\lambda^n(i)$ becomes the root edge, then the complements of $\underline{M}_i^n$ and $\overline{M}_i^n$ become complementary connected components of loops which contain the root edge whose area is close to $2n$. Furthermore, the orientations of the loops $\overline{\ell}_i^n$ and $\underline{\ell}_i^n$ are flipped. Consequently, there exist loops $\underline{\ell}_0^n$ and $\overline{\ell}_0^n$ in $\mathcal{L}^n$ such that the following is true.

(1) $\underline{\ell}_0^n$ is a clockwise loop, $\overline{\ell}_0^n$ is a counterlockwise loop disconnected from the root edge by $\underline{\ell}_0^n$, and there is no loop in $\mathcal{L}^n$ surrounding i which is contained between $\underline{\ell}_0^n$ and $\overline{\ell}_0^n$.

(2) Let $\underline{M}_0^n$ be the complementary connected component of $\underline{\ell}_0^n$ with the largest area. Then $\underline{M}_0^n$ lies on the opposite side of $\underline{\ell}_0^n$ from the root edge and $2n - n^\xi \le \operatorname{Area} \underline{M}_0^n \le 2n - \epsilon_0 n^\xi$.
(3) $\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2} \le \operatorname{len}(\partial \underline{M}_0^n) \le \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}$.
(4) Let $\overline{M}_0^n$ be the complementary connected component of $\overline{\ell}_0^n$ with the largest area. Then $\underline{M}_0^n$ lies on the opposite side of $\overline{\ell}_0^n$ from the root edge and $\operatorname{Area} \overline{M}_0^n \ge 2n - \epsilon_1^{-1}(2n - \operatorname{Area} \underline{M}_0^n)$.
(5) $\operatorname{len}\left(\partial \overline{M}_0^n\right) \ge \epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$.
(6) There is no clockwise loop which surrounds $\overline{\ell}_0^n$ from the root edge such that the area of its largest complementary connected component is at most $2n - \epsilon_0 n^\xi$ and the boundary length of its largest complementary connected component is between $\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}$ and $\epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}$.

Let $\widehat{A}_0^n$ be the event that there exist loops $\underline{\ell}_0^n$ and $\overline{\ell}_0^n$ such that the above 6 conditions hold.

By Lemma 3.11, if we condition on the un-rooted loop-decorated quadrangulation $(M^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$, the law of the root edge $\Bbbk_0^n$ of Q^n is uniform among the edges of Q^n. Since the events $\widehat{A}_i^n$ depend only on $(M^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ (not on the choice of root edge) we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{A}_0^n \,|\, (M^n, \mathcal{L}^n)\right) = \frac{\#\widehat{S}^n(\epsilon)}{2n}.$$

By averaging over all possible realizations of $(M^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$, and using (31), we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{A}_0^n \,|\, X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\right) \ge 1 - q. \tag{32}$$

We will finish the proof by showing that for large enough n, we have $\widehat{A}_0^n \subset \mathcal{G}_n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1')$ for $\epsilon_1' > 0$ depending only on ϵ_1. Indeed, suppose $\widehat{A}_0^n$ occurs, and let $\underline{\ell}_0^n$ and $\overline{\ell}_0^n$ be the loops satisfying the conditions in the definition of $\widehat{A}_0^n$. Let $\widetilde{\iota}_0^n$ (resp. $\widetilde{\iota}_1^n$) be largest $i \in [1, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $\lambda^n(i-1) \in \underline{M}_0^n$ (resp. $\lambda^n(i-1) \in \overline{M}_0^n$). We claim that $\widetilde{\iota}_0^n = \iota_0^n$ and $\widetilde{\iota}_1^n = \iota_1^n$ on the event $\widehat{A}_0^n$. Our proof of this claim relies on some basic facts about the times during which the path λ^n is tracing the edges of a complementary connected component U of a loop $\ell \in \mathcal{L}^n$ which lies on the opposite side of ℓ as the root edge. These facts can be deduced from the construction of Sheffield's bijection [She11, Section 4.1], and are explained in more detail in [GM15b]. The facts are as follows.

(1) If i_* is the largest $i \in [1, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which $\lambda^n(i_* - 1) \in U$, then $X_{i_*} = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and $\phi(i_*)$ is the time at which λ^n begins filling in U. We have $X_{\phi(i_*)} = \textcircled{\text{C}}$ (resp. $X_{\phi(i_*)} = \textcircled{\text{H}}$) if ℓ is traced by λ^n in the counterclockwise (resp. clockwise) direction. Furthermore, we have $U = \lambda^n([\phi(i_*), i_* - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$.
(2) We have $\operatorname{Area} U = i_* - \phi(i_*)$ and $\operatorname{len}(\partial U) = |X(\phi(i_*), i_*)| + 1$.
(3) If i_*' is the smallest $i \ge i_* + 1$ with $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and $\phi(i) \le \phi(i_*) - 1$, then $X_{\phi(i_*')} \ne X_{\phi(i_*)}$. Furthermore, i_* (resp. $\phi(i_*')$) is the time at which λ^n finishes (resp. begins) tracing the loop ℓ.
(4) Conversely, if $i_* \in [1, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $X_{i_*} = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and, with i_*' as above, we have $X_{\phi(i_*')} \ne X_{\phi(i_*)}$, then $\lambda^n([\phi(i_*), i_* - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ is a complementary connected component U of a loop $\ell \in \mathcal{L}^n$ which lies on the opposite side of ℓ as the root edge.

Since $\widetilde{\iota}_0^n$ is the time immediately after λ^n finishes filling in a complementary connected component of clockwise loop which lies on the opposite side of this loop from the root edge, fact 1 above implies that $X_{\widetilde{\iota}_0^n} = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $X_{\phi(\widetilde{\iota}_0^n)} = \textcircled{\text{H}}$, and $\underline{M}_0^n = \lambda^n([\phi(\widetilde{\iota}_0^n), \widetilde{\iota}_0^n]_{\mathbb{Z}})$. Therefore, condition 1 in the definition of ι_0^n holds with $i = \widetilde{\iota}_0^n$. Furthermore, fact 2 implies that

$$\operatorname{Area} \underline{M}_0^n = \widetilde{\iota}_0^n - \phi(\widetilde{\iota}_0^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{len}\left(\partial \overline{M}_0^n\right) = |X(\phi(\widetilde{\iota}_0^n), \widetilde{\iota}_0^n)| + 1.$$

It follows from conditions 2 and 3 in the definition of $\widehat{A}_0^n$ that conditions 2 and 3 in the definition of ι_0^n hold with $i = \widetilde{\iota}_0^n$. By fact 3, we also have that condition 4 in the definition of ι_0^n holds with $i = \widetilde{\iota}_0^n$. Therefore, $\widetilde{\iota}_0^n \le \iota_0^n$ on $\widehat{A}_0^n$.

Conversely, conditions 1 and 4 in the definition of ι_0^n together with fact 4 imply that $\lambda^n([\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n])$ is a connected component of a loop of $\mathcal{L}^n$ which lies on the opposite side of this loop from the root edge. Furthermore, by conditions 2 and 3 in the definition of ι_0^n together with fact 2, this component has area

between $2n - n^\xi$ and $2n - \epsilon_0 n^\xi$ and boundary length between $\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}$ and $\epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}$. This contradicts condition 6 in the definition of $\widehat{A}_0^n$. Thus $\iota_0^n = \widetilde{\iota}_0^n$ on $\widehat{A}_0^n$.

Now we consider $\widetilde{\iota}_1^n$. By fact 1 above, we have $X_{\widetilde{\iota}_1^n} = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $X_{\phi(\widetilde{\iota}_1^n)} = \textcircled{\text{C}}$, and $\overline{M}_0^n = \lambda^n\left([\phi(\widetilde{\iota}_1^n), \widetilde{\iota}_1^n]_{\mathbb{Z}}\right)$. Furthermore, by condition 1 in the definition of $\widehat{A}_0^n$, there is no $i \in (\widetilde{\iota}_1^n, \iota_0^n)_{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $X_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $X_{\phi(i)} = \textcircled{\text{C}}$, and $\phi(i) < \phi(\widetilde{\iota}_1^n)$ (by fact 4, the largest such i would correspond to the exit time of λ^n from a complementary connected component of a loop lying between $\underline{\ell}_0^n$ and $\overline{\ell}_0^n$).

By conditions 4 and 5 in the definition of $\widehat{A}_0^n$ together with fact 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X(\phi(\widetilde{\iota}_1^n), \widetilde{\iota}_1^n)| &= \operatorname{len}\left(\partial \overline{M}_0^n\right) - 1 \geq \epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2} - 1 \geq \epsilon_1' \left(\iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n)\right)^{\xi/2} \\ \widetilde{\iota}_1^n - \phi(\widetilde{\iota}_1^n) &= \operatorname{Area} \overline{M}_0^n \geq 2n - \epsilon_1^{-1}\left(2n - \operatorname{Area} \underline{M}_0^n\right) \\ &\geq 2n - \epsilon_1^{-1} n^\xi \geq \iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n) - (\epsilon_1')^{-1}\left(\iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n)\right)^\xi \end{aligned}$$

for ϵ_1' slightly smaller than $\epsilon_1/2$. The second inequality implies in particular that $\widetilde{\iota}_1^n - \phi(\widetilde{\iota}_1^n) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n)\right)$, so $\widetilde{\iota}_1^n = \iota_1^n$. The two inequalities together imply that $\mathcal{G}_n(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1')$ occurs. □

3.4. **Proof of Lemma 3.9.** In this subsection, we will prove Lemma 3.9 and thereby complete the proof of Proposition 3.2. This section is the only place in the paper where the (infinite-volume version of the) main result of [GM15b] is needed. Recall from Remark 1.1 that the proof of the infinite volume version of the main result of [GM15b] requires only the results of [She11, GMS15, GS15, DMS14], *not* the results of the present paper.

Proof of Lemma 3.9. We first prove the measurability statement. It follows from Sheffield's bijection (see also [GM15b]) that for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, the time $\theta_{i,j}$ when λ finishes tracing the loop $\ell_{i,j}$ can be described as follows: $\theta_{i,j}$ is the jth smallest $k > i$ such that $X_k = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $\phi(k) < i$, and $X_{\phi(k)} \neq X_{\phi(\widetilde{k})}$, for $\widetilde{k}$ the largest $k' \in [i, k)_{\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying $X_{\widetilde{k}} = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and $X_{\phi(\widetilde{k})} < i$. From this, we infer that for each $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_1 < i < k_2$, the event $\{\phi(\theta_{i,j}) = k_1, \theta_{i,j} = k_2\}$ is determined by $X_{k_1} \dots X_{k_2}$. Furthermore, the part of the infinite-volume FK planar map traced by the path λ during the time interval $[\phi(\overline{\theta}_i^n), \overline{\theta}_i^n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is determined by the word $X_{\phi(\overline{\theta}_i^n)} \dots X_{\overline{\theta}_i^n}$. It therefore follows from the definition of $\widetilde{A}_i^n$ that this event is determined by $X_1 \dots X_n$ (here we note that $J_i^n(\epsilon_0)$ is the *smallest* $j \in \mathbb{N}$ for which certain conditions hold).

To prove the claimed estimate for $\#\widetilde{S}^n$, let $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ and $\gamma \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$ be determined by p as in (3). Let Γ be a whole-plane CLE_κ (as defined in [MWW14a, KW14]) and let $(\mathbb{C}, h, 0, \infty)$ be a γ-quantum cone independent from Γ (as defined in [DMS14, Section 4.3]). We will first estimate the probability of a continuum analogue of the events $\widetilde{A}_i^n$ which is defined in terms of Γ and h. We will then apply the infinite-volume version of the scaling limit results in [GM15b] to convert this into an estimate for $\#\widetilde{S}^n$ (c.f. Remark 1.1).

To this end, fix $\alpha > 0$ to be chosen later, depending only on q. Let η be a whole-plane space-filling SLE_κ process from ∞ to ∞ which traces the loops in Γ (as described in [MS13a, Sections 1.2.3 and 4.3] and [DMS14, Footnote 9]), parametrized by quantum mass with respect to h relative to time 0 (so in particular $\eta(0) = 0$). For $t \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$, let $\underline{\ell}^t = \underline{\ell}^t(\epsilon_0)$ be the innermost clockwise loop ℓ in Γ surrounding $\eta(t)$ such that the set of points disconnected from ∞ by ℓ has quantum area at least ϵ_0 and quantum boundary length between ϵ_0 and ϵ_0^{-1} (both measured with respect to h). Let $\overline{\ell}^t$ be the next outermost loop in Γ surrounding $\eta(t)$. Let $A_t = A_t(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ be the continuum analogue of the event $\widetilde{A}_{\lfloor tn \rfloor}^n$, i.e. the event that the following is true.

1. The boundary of the set of points disconnected from ∞ by $\overline{\ell}^t$ has quantum length at least $\epsilon_1 n^{1/2}$.
2. The quantum area of the set of points disconnected from ∞ by $\overline{\ell}^t$ is at most ϵ_1^{-1} times the quantum area of the set of points disconnected from ∞ by $\underline{\ell}^t$.
3. η traces all of $\overline{\eta}^t$ during the time interval $[0, 1]$.

For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, η a.s. traces arbitrarily small CLE_κ loops surrounding $\eta(t)$ whose outer boundaries have finite positive quantum length in arbitrarily small intervals of time surrounding t. Since $\eta(\cdot - s) \overset{d}{=} \eta$ for each fixed $s \in \mathbb{R}$ [DMS14, Lemma 9.3], it follows that there exists and $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ (depending only on α) such that for each $t \in [\alpha, 1-\alpha]$ we have $\mathbb{P}(A_t) \geq 1 - \alpha$. (We remark that the event A_t can equivalently be described in terms of the $\pi/2$-cone times of a correlated Brownian motion as in (4), which gives the left and right quantum boundary lengths of η at time t with respect to h, in a manner which is directly analogous to the description of the event $\widetilde{A}_i^n$ in terms of the word X; see [DMS14, Theorem 1.13] as well as [GM15b].) By the infinite-volume version of the main theorem of [GM15b], we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{A}^n_{\lfloor tn \rfloor}\right) = \mathbb{P}(A_t) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad \forall t \in [\alpha, 1-\alpha].$$

By dominated convergence,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left(\#\widetilde{S}^n\right) = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{A}_i^n\right) \geq 1 - 4\alpha.$$

Hence we can find $n_* = n_*(\alpha, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_*$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}\left(\#\widetilde{S}^n\right) \geq (1-4\alpha)n$. So, for $n \geq n_*$ and $q \in (0,1)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\#\widetilde{S}^n\right) \leq (1-q)n\left(1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\#\widetilde{S}^n \geq (1-q)n\right)\right) + n\mathbb{P}\left(\#\widetilde{S}^n \geq (1-q)n.\right).$$

By re-arranging this inequality, then choosing α sufficiently small depending on q ($\alpha \leq q^2/4$ will suffice), we obtain the statement of the lemma. □

4. Existence of a time with enough cheeseburger orders

The goal of this section is to address the following technical difficulty. Let $\pi_n = \pi_n(\epsilon)$ be the time of Definition 3.3. The time π_n is not a stopping time for the word X, read backward. However, we do have the following. Let x be a realization of $X_{-\pi_n} \dots X_{-1}$. The conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-|x|-1}$ given $\{X_{-\pi_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ is the same as its conditional law given that $\{X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ and each cheeseburger in $X(-J, -|x| - 1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $\mathcal{R}(x)$ (c.f. Remark 3.4).

We want to say that this conditional law is similar to the conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-|x|-1}$ given only $\{X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$. For this, we need a lower bound on the conditional probability given $\{X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ that there is no cheeseburger in $X(-J, -|x| - 1)$ matched to a flexible order in $\mathcal{R}(x)$. This probability is uniformly positive provided there are a large number of cheeseburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $\mathcal{R}(x)$. But, we do not know that this is the case, so instead we will construct a time $\widetilde{\pi}_n \geq \pi_n$ which has similar properties to π_n but has the additional property that $X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)$ is likely to contain a large number (of order $n^{\xi/2}$) cheeseburger orders to the left of its leftmost flexible order. The precise properties of the time $\widetilde{\pi}_n$ are described in Lemma 4.2 below.

Recall the definitions of J_m^H, L_m^H, J_m^C, and L_m^C from (11) and the discussion just below. We also introduce the following additional notation.

Definition 4.1. For a word x consisting of elements of Θ, we write $\mathfrak{c}_f(x)$ for the number of cheeseburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $\mathcal{R}(x)$ (or the number of cheeseburger orders in $\mathcal{R}(x)$ if $\mathcal{R}(x)$ contains no flexible orders). We also let $\mathfrak{r}(x) := \mathfrak{c}_f(x)/\mathfrak{o}(x)$, with $\mathfrak{o}(x)$ as in (7) of Notation 1.7.

The main result of this section is the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\epsilon_1 > \epsilon_2 > 0$. and let $\pi_n = \pi_n(\epsilon_1)$ be as in Definition 3.3 There is a random time $\widetilde{\pi}_n = \widetilde{\pi}_n(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \in [1, J]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ with the following properties.*

(1) We have $\widetilde{\pi}_n \geq \pi_n$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{F}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -\pi_n)) = 0$.

(2) *Whenever $\pi_n < J$, we have*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(X(-\pi_n,-1)) - \epsilon_2 n^{\xi/2} \leq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n,-1)) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(X(-\pi_n,-1)) \quad \text{and}$$
$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{C}}(X(-\pi_n,-1)) - \frac{1}{2} n^{\xi/2} \leq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{C}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n,-1)) .$$

(3) *Let x be any realization of $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1}$ and let $\mathfrak{o}(x)$ be as in (7) of Notation 1.7. The conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-|x|-1}$ given $\{X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ is the same as the conditional law of $X_{-J^H_{\mathfrak{o}(x)}} \dots X_{-1}$ (defined as in (11)) given the event that each cheeseburger in $X(-J^H_{\mathfrak{o}(x)}, -1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in x when we consider the reduced word $\mathcal{R}\left(X(-J^H_{\mathfrak{o}(x)}, -1)x\right)$.*

(4) *There is an $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$ and each $\zeta \geq n^{-\xi/2}$, we have (in the notation of Definition 4.1)*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathfrak{c}_f\left(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n,-1)\right) \leq \zeta n^{\xi/2} \,|\, X_{-\pi_n} \dots X_{-1}\right) \mathbb{1}_{(\pi_n < J)} \preceq \zeta^{100}$$

with the implicit constant deterministic and independent of ζ and n.

Remark 4.3. Condition 4 is the key property of $\widetilde{\pi}_n$. The other conditions in Proposition 4.2 hold with π_n in place of $\widetilde{\pi}_n$. See the discussion above for an explanation of why we need condition 4.

Although $\widetilde{\pi}_n$ is not a stopping time for the word X read backward, the following lemma allows us to compare the conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-1}$ given a realization of $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1}$ to the conditional law we would get if $\widetilde{\pi}_n$ were in fact a stopping time.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\widetilde{x}$ be a realization of $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\widetilde{\pi}_n < J$. Let $\mathfrak{c}_f(\widetilde{x})$ and $\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})$ be as in Definition 4.1 and let $\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})$ be as in (7). The conditional law of the word $X_{-J} \dots X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n - 1}$ given $\{X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to its conditional law given only $\{X_{-|\widetilde{x}|-1} \dots X_{-1}\}$, with Radon-Nikodym derivative bounded above by $\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})^{-1+o_{\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})}(1)}$. Here the $o_{\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})}(1)$ tends to zero as $\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x}) \to 0$, at a rate depending only on $\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})$*

Proof. Fix a realization $\widetilde{x}$ as in the statement of the lemma. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J^H_{\widetilde{x},m}$ be the smallest $j \geq |\widetilde{x}|+1$ for which $X(-j, -|\widetilde{x}|-1)$ contains m hamburgers and let $L^H_{\widetilde{x},m} := d^*\left(X(-J^H_{\widetilde{x},m}, -|\widetilde{x}|-1)\right)$. Note that the conditional law of the pairs $(J^H_{\widetilde{x},m} - |\widetilde{x}|, L^H_{\widetilde{x},m})$ given $\{X_{-|\widetilde{x}|} \dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\}$ is the same as the law of the pairs (J^H_m, L^H_m) of (11).

By condition 3 of Proposition 4.2, the conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-|\widetilde{x}|-1}$ given $\{X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\}$ is the same as the conditional law of $X_{-J^H_{\widetilde{x},\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})}} \dots X_{-|\widetilde{x}|-1}$ given that every cheeseburger in $X(-J^H_{\widetilde{x},\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})}, -|\widetilde{x}|-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-|\widetilde{x}|, -1)$. By Lemma 4.6 (proven just below), the conditional probability that this is the case given $\{X_{-|\widetilde{x}|} \dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\}$ is at least $\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})^{1+o_{\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})}(1)}$. The Radon-Nikodym derivative of the conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-|\widetilde{x}|-1}$ given $\{X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\}$ with respect to its conditional law given $\{X_{-|\widetilde{x}|} \dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\}$ is bounded above by the reciporical of this conditional probability. □

4.1. **Probability of few cheeseburgers before a given number of hamburgers.** In this section we will prove an estimate for the probability that $J^H_h < J^C_c$ for h larger than c. We start by addressing the analogous problem for Brownian motion.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $Z = (U, V)$ be a correlated Brownian motion as in (4). For $b > 0$, let τ^U_b be the smallest $t > 0$ for which $U(t) = b$ and for $\zeta > 0$, let τ^V_ζ be the smallest $t > 0$ for which $V(t) = \zeta$. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau^U_1 < \tau^V_\zeta,\, V(\tau^U_1) \leq -1\right) \succeq \zeta \tag{33}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on p. Furthermore, for each $q \in (0,1)$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$, depending only on q, such that for each $\zeta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(V(\tau_1^U) - \sup_{s\in[0,\tau_1^U]} V(s) \le -\delta_0 \,|\, \tau_1^U < \tau_\zeta^V \right) \ge 1-q. \tag{34}$$

Proof. Let $L := \{1\} \times (-\infty, -1]$ and for $\zeta > 0$ let $L'_\zeta := \mathbb{R} \times \{\zeta\}$. Let

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{p}{1-p} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-2p}}{1-p} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \widetilde{Z} = (\widetilde{U}, \widetilde{V}) := AZ.$$

Then $\widetilde{Z}$ is a pair of independent Brownian motions. The event $\{\tau_1^U \le \tau_\zeta^V, V(\tau_1^V) \le -1\}$ is the same as the event that $\widetilde{Z}$ hits AL before hitting AL'_ζ. The set AL'_ζ is a horizontal line at distance proportional to ζ from the origin. Therefore, the probability that $\widetilde{Z}$ fails to hit AL'_ζ before time 1 is proportional to ζ. By [Shi85, Theorem 2], applied with angle π, the conditional law of $\widetilde{Z}$ given that it fails to hit AL'_ζ before time 1 converges as $\zeta \to 0$ (with respect to the uniform topology) to the law of a random path in the lower half plane which has positive probability to hit AL before time 1. This yields (33).

To obtain (34), we will first argue that for any $q \in (0,1)$, there exists a deterministic time $T > 0$ such that for any $\zeta > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_1^U \ge T \,|\, \tau_1^U < \tau_\zeta^V\right) \ge \sqrt{1-q}. \tag{35}$$

Let a_ζ be the distance from the point $A(L \cap L'_\zeta)$ to the origin. Note that a_ζ is bounded below by a constant a which is independent of ζ. Let $\widetilde{\tau}_a$ be the first time $\widetilde{U}$ hits a. Then $\widetilde{\tau}_a$ is independent from $\widetilde{V}$ and we have $\tau_1^U \ge \widetilde{\tau}_a$. Therefore, for any $T > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_1^U < T \,|\, \tau_1^U < \tau_\zeta^V\right) &\le \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{\tau}_a < T \wedge \tau_\zeta^V\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_1^U < \tau_\zeta^V\right)} \\ &\preceq \zeta^{-1} \sum_{k=\lceil \log_2 T^{-1}\rceil}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{\tau}_a \le 2^{-k}, \tau_\zeta^V \ge 2^{-k-1}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used (33). By the Gaussian tail bound,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{\tau}_a \le 2^{-k}\right) \preceq e^{-b2^k}$$

for b a constant independent of k, T, and ζ. Furthermore, by Brownian scaling we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_\zeta^V \ge 2^{-k-1}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_1^V \ge \zeta^{-2} 2^{-k-1}\right) \preceq \zeta 2^{k/2}$$

where here we used that τ_1^V has the law of a constant multiple of a 1/2-stable random variable. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_1^U < T \,|\, \tau_1^U < \tau_\zeta^V\right) \preceq \sum_{k=\lceil \log_2 T^{-1}\rceil}^{\infty} 2^{k/2} e^{-b2^k},$$

which tends to 0 as $T \to 0$. This implies (35).

By [Shi85, Theorem 2] with angle π, for any $q \in (0,1)$ and $T > 0$, we can find $\delta_0 > 0$, depending only on q and T, such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(V(\tau_1^U) - \sup_{s\in[0,\tau_1^U]} V(s) \le -\delta_0 \,|\, \tau_\zeta^V > T \right) \ge \sqrt{1-q}.$$

By combining this with (35), we infer (34). □

Lemma 4.6. *For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let J_m^H (resp. J_m^C) be the smallest $j \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $X(-j,-1)$ contains m hamburgers (resp. cheeseburgers). For $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(J_m^H < J_{\lfloor \epsilon m \rfloor}^C\right) \succeq \epsilon^{1+o_\epsilon(1)}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on p and the $o_\epsilon(1)$ depending only on ϵ and p.

Proof. The proof is similar to some of the arguments in [GMS15, Section 2]. Fix $\delta > 0$, to be chosen later. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let $r_m^k(\epsilon) := \lfloor \delta^{-k} \epsilon m \rfloor$. Also let $\Bbbk(\epsilon) := \lfloor \frac{\log \epsilon}{\log \delta} \rfloor$ be the smallest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $r_m^k(\epsilon) \geq m$. Let $E_m^k(\epsilon)$ be the event that $X(-J^H_{r_m^k(\epsilon)}, -J^H_{r_m^{k-1}(\epsilon)} - 1)$ contains at least $r_m^k(\epsilon)$ cheeseburger orders and at most $r_m^{k-1}(\epsilon)$ cheeseburgers. Then we have

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{\Bbbk(\epsilon)} E_m^k(\epsilon) \subset \left\{ J_m^H \geq J_{\lfloor \epsilon m \rfloor}^C \right\}. \tag{36}$$

By [She11, Theorem 2.5] and Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_m^k(\epsilon)\right) \succeq \delta + o_{\epsilon m}(1),$$

with the implicit constant depending only on p and the $o_{\epsilon m}(1)$ depending only on ϵm (not on k). Hence there is a $b > 0$, depending only on p, such that for any given $\delta > 0$, we can find $n_* = n_*(\delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that whenever $\epsilon m \geq n_*$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_m^k(\epsilon)\right) \geq b\delta.$$

By (36), in this case we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(J_m^H \geq J_{\lfloor \epsilon m \rfloor}^C\right) \geq (b\delta)^{\Bbbk(\epsilon)} \succeq b^{\frac{\log \epsilon}{\log \delta}} \epsilon.$$

Since δ does not depend on b, by making δ arbitrarily small relative to b, we obtain the statement of the lemma. □

4.2. **Monotonicity conditioned on cheeseburgers being matched to cheeseburger orders.** For a word $x = x_0 \dots x_{|x|}$ consisting of elements of Θ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F_m(x)$ be the event that every cheeseburger in $X(-J_m^H, -1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in x when we consider the reduced word $\mathcal{R}(X(-J_m^H,-1)x)$. Equivalently, there is *not* a $j \in [1, J_m^H]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ with the property that $X_{-j} = \textcircled{C}$; and on the event $\{X_0 \dots X_{|x|} = x\}$, we have $\phi(-j) \geq 0$ and either $X_{\phi(-j)} = \boxed{\text{F}}$ or $\phi(-j) > |x|$.

For $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_l(x)$ be the lth smallest $i \geq 0$ such that $x_i = \boxed{\text{F}}$ and x_i does not have a match in x; or $f_l(x) = |x| + 1$ if no such i exists. We note that with $\mathfrak{c}_f(x)$ as in Definition 4.1,

$$\mathfrak{c}_f(x) = \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}\left(\mathcal{R}(x_0 \dots x_{f_1(x)-1})\right).$$

Lemma 4.7. *Let $x = x_0 \dots x_{|x|}$ and $x' = x'_0 \dots x'_{|x'|}$ be two words such that $\mathcal{R}(x)$ and $\mathcal{R}(x')$ contain no burgers; $x_{f_1(x)} \dots x_{|x|} = x'_{f_1(x')} \dots x_{|x'|}$; $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}\left(\mathcal{R}(x_0 \dots x_{f_1(x)-1})\right) = \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}\left(\mathcal{R}(x'_0 \dots x'_{f_1(x')})\right)$; and $\mathfrak{c}_f(x) \leq \mathfrak{c}_f(x')$. Then for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $F_m(x) \subset F_m(x')$.*

Proof. Let $k := \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(x))$ and $h := \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(\mathcal{R}(x_0 \dots x_{f_1(x)-1}))$. By hypothesis the definitions of k and h, are unchanged if we replace x with x'.

We induct on k. The case $k = 0$ is trivial. Now assume $k > 1$ and we have proven $F_m(x) \subset F_m(x')$ for words x and x' satisfying the hypothesis of the lemma with $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(x)) < k$. If $F_m(x)$ occurs, then either $m \leq h$ and $J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J_m^H$; or $J_{h+1}^H < J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1}$. In the former case, it is clear that $F_m(x')$ also occurs. Now assume we are in the latter case. Let $\widetilde{x} := X(-J_{h+1}^H, -1)x$ and $\widetilde{x}' := X(-J_{h+1}^H, -1)x'$. The $\boxed{\text{F}}$ symbol corresponding to $x_{f_1(x)}$ is matched to $X_{-J_{h+1}^H}$ in $\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x})$, and the word $X(-J_{h+1}^H, -1)$ contains no flexible orders. Therefore, we have $\widetilde{x}_{f_1(\widetilde{x})} \dots \widetilde{x}_{|\widetilde{x}|} = x_{f_2(x)} \dots x_{|x|}$. Similarly,

$\widetilde{x}'_{f_1(\widetilde{x}')}\dots\widetilde{x}'_{|\widetilde{x}'|} = x'_{f_2(x')}\dots x'_{|x'|}$. By our hypothesis on x and x', we therefore have $\widetilde{x}_{f_1(\widetilde{x})}\dots\widetilde{x}_{|\widetilde{x}|} = \widetilde{x}'_{f_1(\widetilde{x}')}\dots\widetilde{x}'_{|\widetilde{x}'|}$. Furthermore, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}\left(\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x}_0\dots\widetilde{x}_{f_1(\widetilde{x})-1})\right) = \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}\left(\mathcal{R}(x_{f_1(x)+1}\dots x_{f_2(x)-1})\right) = \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}\left(\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x}'_0\dots\widetilde{x}'_{f_1(\widetilde{x}')-1})\right)$$

and since $J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_{h+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x}_0\dots\widetilde{x}_{f_1(\widetilde{x})-1})\right) &= \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(\mathcal{R}(x_{f_1(x)+1}\dots x_{f_2(x)-1})\right) + \mathfrak{c}_f(x) - L^H_{h+1}\\ &\le \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(\mathcal{R}(x'_{f_1(x')+1}\dots x'_{f_2(x')-1})\right) + \mathfrak{c}_f(x') - L^H_{h+1}\\ &= \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x}'_0\dots\widetilde{x}'_{f_1(\widetilde{x}')-1})\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence the words $\widetilde{x}$ and $\widetilde{x}'$ satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma.

If $F_m(x)$ occurs, then every cheeseburger in $X(-J^H_m, -J^H_{h+1}-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $\widetilde{x}$ (here we use that $X(-J^H_{h+1}, -1)$ contains no $\boxed{\mathrm{F}}$'s). Therefore, $F_{m-h-1}(\widetilde{x})$ occurs. Since $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(\widetilde{x}) = k-1$, the inductive hypothesis implies that $F_{m-h-1}(\widetilde{x}')$ occurs. Hence, we have $J^H_{h+1} < J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} \le J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x')+1}$ and each cheeseburger in $X(-J^H_m, -J^H_{h+1}-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-J^H_{h+1}, -1)x'$. It follows that $F_m(x')$ occurs. That is, $F_m(x) \subset F_m(x')$. □

Lemma 4.8. *Fix a word $x = x_0\dots x_{|x|}$ consisting of elements of Θ and write $h := \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(\mathcal{R}(x_0\dots x_{f_1(x)-1}))$. For any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, any $m \in [1,h]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and any $m' \ge m$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L^H_m \le l \,|\, F_{m'}(x)\right) \ge \mathbb{P}\left(L^H_m \le l \,|\, J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\right).$$

Proof. We have $F_{m'}(x) \subset \{J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\}$, so by Bayes' rule,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L^H_m \le l \,|\, F_{m'}(x)\right) = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{m'}(x) \,|\, L^H_m \le l,\, J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\right)\mathbb{P}\left(L^H_m \le l \,|\, J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{m'}(x) \,|\, J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\right)}. \tag{37}$$

On the event $\{J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\}$, the word $\mathcal{R}\left(X(-J^H_m, -1)x\right)$ contains precisely $h-m$ hamburger orders and $\mathfrak{c}_f(x) - L^H_m$ cheeseburger orders to the left of its leftmost flexible order. By Lemma 4.7, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_{m'}(x) \,|\, L^H_m = l,\, J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\right)$$

is decreasing in l. In particular,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_{m'}(x) \,|\, L^H_m \le l,\, J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\right) \ge \mathbb{P}\left(F_{m'}(x) \,|\, J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x)+1} > J^H_m\right).$$

Combining this with (37) yields the statement of the lemma. □

4.3. **Regularity conditioned on few cheeseburgers before a given number of hamburgers.** In light of Lemma 4.8, to study the conditional law of $X_{-J^H_m}\dots X_{-1}$ given $F_{m'}(x)$ (in the terminology of that lemma), it suffices to study the conditional law of $X_{-J^H_m}\dots X_{-1}$ given $J^H_m < J^C_c$ for an appropriate choice of c. In this section, we will study this latter conditional law. In particular, we will prove the following.

Lemma 4.9. *For each $q \in (0,1)$, there is a $\zeta > 0$ and an $m_* = m_*(q,\zeta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $h \ge m_*$ and each $c \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{C}}\left(X(-J^H_h, -1)\right) \ge \zeta h \,|\, J^H_h < J^C_c\right) \ge 1 - q.$$

In the case where $c \geq h$, we have $\mathbb{P}(J_h^H < J_c^C) \geq 1/2$, so the statement of the Lemma 4.9 is immediate from [She11, Theorem 2.5]. Hence we can assume without loss of generality that $c < h$.

The proof of Lemma 4.9 in this case is similar to the argument of [GMS15, Section 3.4]. For $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \geq 1$, let $m_{c,a} := \lfloor ac \rfloor$. Also let

$$F_{c,a} := \left\{ J^H_{m_{c,a}} < J^C_c \right\}, \qquad E_{c,a}(\zeta) := \left\{ \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}} \left(X(-J^H_{m_{c,a}}, -1) \right) > \zeta m_{c,a} \right\} \cap F_{c,a}.$$

Roughly speaking, will prove by induction that for each $q \in (0,1)$, there exists a $\zeta > 0$ and $m_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that whenever $m_{c,a} \geq m_*$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta) \,|\, F_{c,a} \right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Lemma 4.10. *Let $q \in (0,1)$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$. There is a $\delta_0 > 0$, depending only on q and λ, with the following property. For each $\zeta > 0$, there exists $m_* = m_*(\zeta, \delta_0, q, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a > 0$ with $m_{c,a} \geq m_*$; each realization x of $X_{-J^H_{m_{c,a}}} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $E_{c,a}(\zeta)$ occurs; and each $b \in \left[(1-\lambda)^{-1} a, \lambda^{-1} a \right]$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\delta_0) \,|\, X_{-J^H_{m_{c,a}}} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, F_{c,b} \right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Proof. For x as in the statement of the lemma, we have $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(x)) = 0$, so the conditional law of $X_{-J^H_{m_{c,b}}} \dots X_{-J^H_{m_{c,a}}-1}$ given $\{X_{-J^H_{m_{c,a}}} \dots X_{-1} = x\} \cap F_{c,b}$ is the same as its conditional law given that $\mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\mathrm{C}}} \left(X(-J^H_{m_{c,b}}, -J^H_{m_{c,a}} - 1) \right) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}(\mathcal{R}(x)) + c$. By [She11, Theorem 2.5], the probability of this event is bounded below by a constant which depends on ζ and λ, but not on c.

By [She11, Theorem 2.5], as $m \to \infty$ we have

$$\left(m^{-2} J^H_m, -m^{-1} \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}} \left(X(-J^H_m, -1) \right) \right) \to \left(\tau_1^U, V(\tau_1^U) - \sup_{s \in [0, \tau_1^U]} V(s) \right)$$

in law, with the objects on the right defined as in Lemma 4.5. The statement of the lemma now follows from Lemma 4.5. □

Lemma 4.11. *For each $q, q_0 \in (0,1)$, $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\zeta_0 = \zeta_0(q, q_0, \epsilon) > 0$ and $a_0 = a_0(q, q_0, \epsilon) > 0$ such that for each $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_0]$, there exists $m_* = m_*(q, q_0, \lambda, \epsilon, \zeta)$ such that the following is true. Suppose we are given $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \geq a_0$ such that $m_{c,a} \geq m_*$ and $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \,|\, F_{c,a} \right) \geq q_0$. Then whenever $b \in \left[(1-\lambda)^{-1} a, \lambda^{-1} a \right]$ and $b' \in \left[(1-\lambda)^{-1} b, \lambda^{-1} b \right]$,*

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b'} \,|\, E_{c,b}(\zeta)^c \cap F_{c,b} \right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b'} \,|\, E_{c,b}(\zeta) \right)} \leq q. \tag{38}$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.10, we can find $\delta_0 > 0$, depending only on p, such that for each $\zeta > 0$, there exists $\widetilde{m}_* = \widetilde{m}_*(\zeta, \delta_0, \lambda)$ such that whenever $m_{c,a} \geq \widetilde{m}_*$ and b is as in the statement of the lemma, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\delta_0) \,|\, E_{c,a}(\zeta) \cap F_{c,b} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence if $m_{c,a} \geq \widetilde{m}_*$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\delta_0) \,|\, E_{c,b}(\zeta) \right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\delta_0) \,|\, F_{c,b} \right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\delta_0) \,|\, E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \cap F_{c,b} \right) \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \,|\, F_{c,b} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \,|\, F_{c,b} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

By Bayes' rule,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \,|\, F_{c,b} \right) = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \,|\, E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \right) \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \,|\, F_{c,a} \right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \,|\, E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \right) \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \,|\, F_{c,a} \right) + \mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \cap E_{c,a}(\epsilon)^c \,|\, F_{c,a} \right)}. \tag{40}$$

By [She11, Theorem 2.5] and our assumption on $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\epsilon) \,|\, F_{c,a}\right)$, this quantity is bounded below by a constant depending only on q_0 and ϵ (not on ζ). By (39), we arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\delta_0) \,|\, E_{c,b}(\zeta)\right) \succeq 1.$$

By combining this with [She11, Theorem 2.5] we obtain that for b' as in the statement of the lemma,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b'} \,|\, E_{c,b}(\zeta)\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b'} \,|\, E_{c,b}(\delta_0)\right) \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\delta_0) \,|\, E_{c,b}(\zeta)\right) \succeq 1. \tag{41}$$

Next we consider the numerator in (38). Observe that if $F_{c,b'} \cap E_{c,b}(\zeta)^c$ occurs, then $X(-J^H_{m_{c,b'}}, -J^H_{m_{c,b}} - 1)$ contains at most $\zeta m_{c,b} + c$ cheeseburgers. To estimate the probability that this occurs, consider the correlated Brownian motion $Z = (U, V)$ of (4). By [She11, Theorem 2.5], for each $s > 0$, the probability that $X(-J^H_{m_{c,b'}}, -J^H_{m_{c,b}} - 1)$ contains at most $sm_{c,b}$ cheeseburgers converges as $m_{c,b} \to \infty$ to the probability that U reaches height $b' - b$ before V reaches height sb. The probability that this occurs tends to 0 as $s \to 0$, at a rate depending only on λ. It follows that for each $\alpha > 0$, we can find $\zeta_0 > 0$ and $a_0 > 0$ (depending only on α) such that for each $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_0]$, there exists $m_* = m_*(\zeta, \alpha, \epsilon) \geq \widetilde{m}_*$ such that whenever $a \geq a_0$ and $m_{c,a} \geq m_*$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b'} \,|\, E_{c,b}(\zeta)^c \cap F_{c,b}\right) \leq \alpha. \tag{42}$$

We conclude by combining (41) and (42) and choosing α sufficiently small depending on q and λ. □

Lemma 4.12. *Let $q, q_0 \in (0,1)$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$. There is a $\zeta_0 > 0$ and an $a_0 > 0$ (depending only on q and q_0) such that for each $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_0]$ we can find $m_* = m_*(q, q_0, \zeta) \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. Suppose $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \geq a_0$ with $m_{c,a} \geq m_*$ and $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta) \,|\, F_{c,a}\right) \geq q_0$. Suppose also that $b \in \left[(1-\lambda)^{-1}a, \lambda^{-1}a\right]$. Then $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\zeta) \,|\, F_{c,b}\right) \geq 1 - q$.*

Proof. Given a and b as in the statement of the lemma, let $\widetilde{b} := (a+b)/2$. By Lemma 4.10 we can find $\zeta_0 > 0$ (depending only on q and λ) such that for $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_0]$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \zeta]$, there exists $\widetilde{m}_* = \widetilde{m}_*(\zeta, \epsilon, q, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $m_{c,a} \geq \widetilde{m}_*$ and $b \in \left[(1-\lambda)^{-1}a, \lambda^{-1}a\right]$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\zeta) \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\epsilon) \cap F_{c,b}\right) \geq 1 - q \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta) \,|\, E_{c,a}(\zeta) \cap F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right) \geq 1 - q. \tag{43}$$

Henceforth fix $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_0]$.

Fix $\alpha \in (0,1)$ to be chosen later (depending on q, q_0, and ζ). By Lemma 4.11, we can find $\zeta' \in (0, \zeta]$ and $a_0 > 0$ (depending on α, q_0, and ζ) and $m_* \geq \widetilde{m}_*$ (depending on α, q_0, ζ', and ζ) for which the following holds. If $a \geq a_0$, $m_{c,a} \geq m_*$, and $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta) \,|\, F_{c,a}\right) \geq q_0$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')^c \cap F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right) \leq \alpha \mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')\right). \tag{44}$$

In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\zeta) \,|\, F_{c,b}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\zeta) \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')\right) \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta') \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')\right) \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta') \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')^c \cap F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right) \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')^c \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right)} \\ &\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\zeta) \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')\right)} \times \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta') \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta') \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right) + \alpha \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')^c \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right)}. \end{aligned} \tag{45, 46}$$

By (43),

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\zeta) \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,b} \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')\right)} = \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\zeta) \,|\, E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta') \cap F_{c,b}\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta') \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta') \,|\, E_{c,a}(\zeta) \cap F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right) \mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta) \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right) \geq (1-q)\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta) \,|\, F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right). \tag{47}$$

By Bayes' rule,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right)$$

$$\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\,|\,E_{c,a}(\zeta)\right)\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,a}\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\,|\,E_{c,a}(\zeta)\right)\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,a}\right)+\mathbb{P}\left(F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\,|\,E_{c,a}(\zeta)^c\cap F_{c,a}\right)}. \tag{48}$$

By [She11, Theorem 2.5] and our assumption on $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,a}\right)$, this quantity is at least a positive constant c depending on q_0, λ and ζ (but not on ζ'). Therefore, (47) implies $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,\widetilde{b}}(\zeta')\,|\,F_{c,\widetilde{b}}\right)\geq(1-q)c$, so (46) implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b'}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,b'}\right)\geq\frac{(1-q)^2c}{(1-q)c+\alpha}.$$

If we choose α sufficiently small relative to c (and hence ζ' sufficiently small and m_* sufficiently large), we can make this quantity as close to $1-q$ as we like. □

In order to deal with the case of very small values of c, we will need the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 4.13. *There is a constant $C>0$, depending only on p, such that for each $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and each $\zeta>0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{C}}\left(X(-J_r^H,-1)\right)\leq\zeta m,\,\forall r\in[1,m]_{\mathbb{Z}}\right)\preceq e^{-C/\zeta}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on p.

Proof. Let $\Bbbk_\zeta:=\lfloor 1/\zeta\rfloor$. For $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and $k\in[1,\Bbbk_\zeta]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, let $r_m^k(\zeta):=\lfloor k\zeta m\rfloor$ and let

$$E_m^k(\zeta):=\left\{L^H_{\lfloor k\zeta m\rfloor}-L^H_{\lfloor(k-1)\zeta m\rfloor+1}\geq\zeta m\right\},$$

where here we use the convention that $L_0^H=0$. The events $E_m^k(\zeta)$ are independent. By [GMS15, Lemma 2.1], we can find $q\in(0,1)$, depending only on p, such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_m^k(\zeta)\right)\geq q,\quad\forall m\in\mathbb{N},\quad\forall\zeta>0,\quad\forall k\in[1,\Bbbk_\zeta]_{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

On the event $E_m^k(\zeta)$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-\lfloor k\zeta m\rfloor,-1)\right)\geq\zeta m.$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J_r^H,-1)\right)\leq\zeta m,\,\forall r\in[1,m]_{\mathbb{Z}}\right)\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{k=1}^{\Bbbk_\zeta}E_m^k(\zeta)\right)\leq(1-q)^{\Bbbk_\zeta}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 4.9. By Lemma 4.12, for each $q\in(0,1/2)$ we can find $\zeta_0>0$ and $a_0>0$ such that for each $\zeta\in(0,\zeta_0]$, there exists $\widetilde{m}_*=\widetilde{m}_*(q,\zeta)\in\mathbb{N}$ with the following property. Suppose $c\in\mathbb{N}$ and $a\geq a_0$ with $m_{c,a}\geq\widetilde{m}_*$ and $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,a}\right)\geq1/2$. Then for each $b\in\left[(1-\lambda)^{-1}a,\lambda^{-1}a\right]$ we have $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,b}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,b}\right)\geq1-q$. By [She11, Theorem 2.5], we can find $\zeta\in(0,\zeta_0]$ (depending on a_0 and q) such that for every $c\in\mathbb{N}$ and $a\in[1,a_0]$ we have $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,a}\right)\geq1-q$. By induction, it follows that for every $c\geq\widetilde{m}_*$ and every $a\geq1$ we have $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{c,a}(\zeta)\,|\,F_{c,a}\right)\geq1-q$. Hence for $h\geq c\geq\widetilde{m}_*$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J_h^H,-1)\right)\geq\zeta h\,|\,J_h^H<J_c^C\right)\geq1-q.$$

We still need to consider the case where c is smaller than $\widetilde{m}_*$. For $h\in\mathbb{N}$, let M_h be the smallest $m\in\mathbb{N}$ for which $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J_m^H,-1)\right)\geq h^{1/3}$. By Lemma 4.13,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(M_h<h^{1/2}\right)=o_h^\infty(h),$$

at a rate depending only on p. Hence for any $c \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(M_h < h^{1/2} \,|\, J_h^H < J_c^C\right) \le o_h^\infty(h)\mathbb{P}\left(J_h^H < J_1^C\right)^{-1}.$$

By, e.g., Lemma 5.5, we have that $\mathbb{P}\left(J_h^H < J_1^C\right)$ is bounded below by some power of h. It follows that we can find $m_* \ge \widetilde{m}_*$ such that $m_*^{1/3} \ge \widetilde{m}_*$ and for $h \ge m_*$ and $c \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(M_h < h^{1/2} \,|\, J_h^H < J_c^C\right) \ge 1 - q.$$

Let x be a realization of $X_{-J^H_{M_h}} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $M_h < h^{1/2}$ and $J_c^C > J^H_{M_h}$. The conditional law of $X_{-J_h^H} \dots X_{-J^H_{M_h}-1}$ given $\{X_{-J^H_{M_h}} \dots X_{-1}\}$ and $\{J_h^H < J_c^C\}$ is the same as its conditional law given $\{X_{-J^H_{M_h}} \dots X_{-1}\}$ and the event that $X(-J_h^H, -J^H_{M_h} - 1)$ contains at most $c - d^*(\mathcal{R}(x)) \ge h^{1/3} \ge \widetilde{m}_*$ cheeseburger orders. By the $c \ge \widetilde{m}_*$ case, we infer that there exists $\zeta > 0$ such that for each $h \ge m_*$ and $c \le h$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J_h^H, -J^H_{M_h} - 1)\right) \ge \zeta h \,|\, M_h < h^{1/2},\, J_h^H < J_c^C\right) \ge 1 - q.$$

Hence for such an h we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J_h^H, -1)\right) \ge \zeta h \,|\, J_h^H < J_c^C\right) \ge (1-q)^2.$$

Since q was arbitrary, this completes the proof. □

4.4. **Proof of Proposition 4.2.** To deduce Proposition 4.2 from the results of the preceding subsections, we will need two further lemmas.

Lemma 4.14. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\pi_n = \pi_n(\epsilon_1)$ be as in Definition 3.3. Let $x = x_{-|x|} \dots x_{-1}$ be a word consisting of elements of Θ such that $\mathcal{R}(x)$ contains no orders and with positive probability we have $X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x$ and $\pi_n < |x|$. Then π_n is determined by x on this event, i.e. there exists $\mathfrak{j}(x) \in [1, |x|]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that whenever $X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x$ and $\pi_n < |x|$, it holds that $\pi_n = \mathfrak{j}(x)$.*

Proof. Given x as in the statement of the lemma, let $\mathfrak{j}(x)$ be the smallest $j \in [1, |x|]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $j \ge n - \epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$, there are at least $\epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$ hamburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $\mathcal{R}(x_{-j} \dots x_{-1})$, and each cheeseburger in $\mathcal{R}(x_{-|x|} \dots x_{-j-1})$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $\mathcal{R}(x_{-j} \dots x_{-1})$. Such a j exists since we are assuming that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds with positive probability we have $X_{-\pi_n - k} \dots X_{-1} = x$. We claim that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which this is the case, we have $\mathfrak{j}(x) = \pi_n$ on the event $\{X_{-\pi_n - k} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$.

Indeed, suppose $X_{-\pi_n - k} \dots X_{-1} = x$. By definition, the time π_n satisfies the defining properties of $\mathfrak{j}(x)$. Since $\mathfrak{j}(x)$ is the smallest time in $[1, |x|]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying these properties, it follows that $\pi_n \ge \mathfrak{j}(x)$. If $\pi_n > \mathfrak{j}(x)$, then by minimality of π_n there is a cheeseburger in $X(-J, -\mathfrak{j}(x) - 1)$ which is either matched to a flexible order in $X(-\mathfrak{j}(x), -1)$ or does not have a match in $X(-\mathfrak{j}(x), -1)$. By definition of $\mathfrak{j}(x)$, this cheeseburger cannot appear in $X(-|x|, -\mathfrak{j}(x) - 1)$. Hence there is a cheeseburger in $X(-J, -|x| - 1)$ which either does not have a match in $X(-|x|, -1)$ or is matched to a flexible order in $X(-\mathfrak{j}(x), -1)$. Since $\pi_n \ge \mathfrak{j}(x)$, this cheeseburger appears in $X(-J, -\pi_n - 1)$, which contradicts the definition of π_n. □

Lemma 4.15. *Let $J_{n,0}^H = \pi_n$ and for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let $J_{n,m}^H$ be the smallest $j \ge \pi_n$ for which $X(-j, -\pi_n - 1)$ contains m hamburgers. Let $x = x_{-|x|} \dots x_{-1}$ be a realization of $X(-J_{n,m}^H, -1)$ for which $J > J_{n,m}^H$ (i.e. $\mathcal{R}(x)$ contains no burgers). Let $\mathfrak{o}(x)$ be as in (7). The conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-|x|-1}$ given $\{X_{-J^H_{n,m}} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ is the same as the conditional law of $X_{-J^H_{\mathfrak{o}(x)}} \dots X_{-1}$ given the event $F_{\mathfrak{o}(x)}(x)$ of Section 4.2.*

Proof. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widetilde{J}_{x,m}^H$ be the smallest $j \ge |x|+1$ for which $X(-j, -|x|-1)$ contains m hamburgers. Also let $\mathfrak{j}(x)$ be as in Lemma 4.14, so that on the event $\{X_{-J^H_{n,m}} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$, we have $\pi_n = \mathfrak{j}(x)$.

The event $\{X_{-J^H_{n,m}} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ is the same as the event that $\{X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ and each $j \in [|x|+1, J]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $X_{-j} = \textcircled{\mathrm{C}}$ and $-\phi(-j) \le \mathfrak{j}(x)$ is such that X_{-j} is matched to a cheeseburger in

$X(-\pi_n, -1) = \mathcal{R}(x_{-\mathfrak{j}(x)} \dots x_{-1})$. Since $X(-J^H_{n,m}, -\pi_n - 1)$ contains no flexible orders, this is equivalent to the condition that $\{X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ and each cheeseburger in $X(-J, -|x| - 1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-|x|, -1)$. If this is the case, then every hamburger order and every flexible order in $X(-|x|, -1)$ is matched to a hamburger in $X(-J, -|x| - 1)$, so $J = \widetilde{J}^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)}$.

Conversely, if $X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x$ and every cheeseburger in $X(-\widetilde{J}^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)}, -|x| - 1)$ matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-|x|, -1)$, then the rightmost $\mathfrak{o}(x) - 1$ hamburgers in $X(-\widetilde{J}^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)}, -|x| - 1)$ must be matched to the $\mathfrak{o}(x) - 1$ hamburger orders and flexible orders in $X(-|x|, -1)$. The leftmost hamburger in $X(-\widetilde{J}^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)}, -|x| - 1)$ then has no match in $X(-|x|, -1)$ so we have $\widetilde{J}^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)} = J$.

Thus, $\{X_{-J^H_{n,m}} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ is the same as the event that $\{X_{-|x|} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ and every cheeseburger in $X(-\widetilde{J}^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)}, -|x| - 1)$ matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-|x|, -1)$. By translation invariance, this implies the statement of the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 4.2. For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J^H_{n,m}$ be the smallest $j \geq \pi_n$ such that $X(-j, -\pi_n - 1)$ contains m hamburgers. Also let $L^H_{n,m} := d^* \left(X(-J^H_{n,m}, -\pi_n - 1)\right)$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $m^0_n = 0$ and for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, inductively define

$$m^k_n := \lfloor 2^{-k-1}(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)\epsilon_2 n^{\xi/2} \rfloor + m^{k-1}_n.$$

Also let $\Bbbk_n$ be the largest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $2^{-k-1}(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)\epsilon_2 n^{\xi/2} \geq n^{\xi/4}$.

Fix $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ to be chosen later. For $k \in [0, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, let

$$E^k_n := \left\{ \mathfrak{c}_f \left(X(-J^H_{n,m^k_n}, -1) \right) \geq \delta 2^{-k} n^{\xi/2} \right\}.$$

Let K_n be the minimum of $\Bbbk_n$ and the smallest $k \in [0, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which E^k_n occurs and let

$$\widetilde{\pi}_n := J^H_{n,m^{K_n}_n}.$$

It is clear that $\widetilde{\pi}_n \geq \pi_n$, $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -\pi_n)) = 0$, and $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(X(-\pi_n, -1))$. Furthermore,

$$m^{K_n}_n \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\Bbbk_n} 2^{-k-1}\epsilon_2 n^{\xi/2} \leq \epsilon_2 n^{\xi/2}.$$

Hence if $\pi_n < J$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) \geq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(X(-\pi_n, -1)) - \epsilon_2 n^{\xi/2}.$$

By definition of π_n, on the event $\{\pi_n < J\}$, there are at least $\epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$ hamburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $X(-\pi_n, -1)$. Since $X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -\pi_n - 1)$ has at most $\epsilon_2 n^{\xi/2} \leq \epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$ hamburgers, it follows that this flexible order does not have a match in $X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -\pi_n - 1)$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\text{C}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -\pi_n - 1)) \leq \mathfrak{c}_f \left(X(-\pi_n, -1)\right).$$

If in fact $\mathfrak{c}_f \left(X(-\pi_n, -1)\right) \geq n^{\xi/2}/2$, we have $\widetilde{\pi}_n = \pi_n$. Otherwise, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) \geq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(X(-\pi_n, -1)) - \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\text{C}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -\pi_n - 1)) \geq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(X(-\pi_n, -1)) - \frac{1}{2} n^{\xi/2}.$$

This verifies conditions 1 and 2 in the statement of the lemma.

To obtain condition 3, let x be a realization of $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1}$. By Lemma 4.14, the time π_n is determined by the word $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1}$, so also K_n is determined by $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1}$ (since $m^{K_n}_n$ is the number of hamburgers in $X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -\pi_n - 1)$). Let $\mathfrak{k}$ be the realization of K_n corresponding to our given word x. Since K_n is the minimum of $\Bbbk_n$ and the *smallest* $k \in [0, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which E^k_n occurs, the event $\{X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ is the same as the event that $\{X_{-J^H_{n,m^{\mathfrak{k}}_n}} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$. Condition 3 now follows from Lemma 4.15.

It remains to prove condition 4. Let $k \in [0, \Bbbk_n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and let x^k be a realization of $X_{-J^H_{n,m^k_n}} \dots X_{-1}$ such that the number of hamburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $\mathcal{R}(x^k)$ is at least

$m_n^{k+1} - m_n^k$. By definition, there are at least $\epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$ hamburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $X(-\pi_n, -1)$ on the event $\{\pi_n < J\}$ and we always have $\epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2} - m_n^k < m_n^{k+1} - m_n^k$. Therefore if $\pi_n < J$, the realization of $X_{-J^H_{n,m_n^k}} \dots X_{-1}$ must satisfy the above condition.

By Lemma 4.15, the conditional law of $X_{-J} \dots X_{-J^H_{n,m_n^k}-1}$ given $\{X_{-J^H_{n,m_n^k}} \dots X_{-1} = x^k\}$ is the same as the conditional law of $X_{-J^H_{\mathfrak{o}(x^k)}} \dots X_{-1}$ given the event $F_{\mathfrak{o}(x^k)}(x^k)$ of Section 4.2. By Lemma 4.8, for each $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L^H_{n,m_n^{k+1}} - L^H_{n,m_n^k} \le l \,|\, X_{-J^H_{n,m_n^k}} \dots X_{-1} = x^k\right) \ge \mathbb{P}\left(L^H_{m_n^{k+1}-m_n^k} \le l \,|\, J^H_{m_n^{k+1}-m_n^k} < J^C_{\mathfrak{c}_f(x^k)+1}\right). \tag{49}$$

By Lemma 4.9, for each $q \in (0,1)$ we can find $\delta > 0$ and $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ (depending only on ϵ_1 and ϵ_2) such that for any $n \ge n_*$ and any choice of realization x^k as above, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J^H_{m_n^{k+1}-m_n^k}, -1\right) \ge \delta 2^{-k} n^{\xi/2} \,|\, \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{C}}\left(X(-J^H_{m_n^{k+1}-m_n^k}, -1\right) \le \mathfrak{c}_f(x^k)\right) \ge 1 - q. \tag{50}$$

If $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J^H_{m_n^{k+1}-m_n^k}, -1\right) \ge \delta 2^{-k} n^{\xi/2}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{C}}\left(X(-J^H_{m_n^{k+1}-m_n^k}, -1\right) \le \mathfrak{c}_f(x^k)$, then $L^H_{m_n^{k+1}-m_n^k} \le \mathfrak{c}_f(x^k) - \delta 2^{-k} n^{\xi/2}$. By (49) and (50),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L^H_{n,m_n^{k+1}} - L^H_{n,m_n^k} \le \mathfrak{c}_f(x^k) - \delta 2^{-k} n^{\xi/2} \,|\, X_{-J^H_{n,m_n^k}} \dots X_{-1} = x^k\right) \ge 1 - q.$$

If $L^H_{n,m_n^{k+1}} - L^H_{n,m_n^k} \le \mathfrak{c}_f(x^k) - \delta 2^{-k} n^{\xi/2}$ and $X_{-J^H_{n,m_n^k}} \dots X_{-1} = x^k$, then

$$\mathfrak{c}_f\left(X(-L^H_{n,m_n^{k+1}}, -1)\right) = \mathfrak{c}_f(x^k) - \left(L^H_{n,m_n^{k+1}} - L^H_{n,m_n^k}\right) \ge \delta 2^{-k} n^{\xi/2}.$$

Note that here we use that $m_n^k < \epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$, so that the leftmost flexible order in $\mathcal{R}(x^k)$ coincides with the leftmost flexible order in $X(-\pi_n, -1)$. Hence for this choice of δ, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_n^{k+1} \,|\, X_{-J^H_{n,m_n^k}} \dots X_{-1} = x^k\right) \ge 1 - q.$$

Since each realization x^k as above encodes a realization of $X_{-\pi_n} \dots X_{-1}$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(K_n \ge k \,|\, X_{-\pi_n} \dots X_{-1}\right) \mathbb{1}_{(\pi_n < J)} \le q^k, \quad \forall k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}. \tag{51}$$

For $\zeta \ge n^{\xi/2}$, let $k_n^\zeta := \Bbbk_n \wedge \lfloor \log_2 \frac{\delta}{\zeta} - 1 \rfloor$ be the minimum of $\Bbbk_n$ and the smallest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $\delta 2^{-k} n^{\xi/2} \ge \zeta n^{\xi/2}$. By (51) and the definition of $\widetilde{\pi}_n$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathfrak{c}_f\left(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)\right) \le \zeta n^{\xi/2} \,|\, X_{-\pi_n} \dots X_{-1}\right) \le q^{k_n^\zeta} \preceq (\zeta \wedge n^{-\xi/4})^{a(q)}$$

with the implicit constant independent of ζ and n; and $a(q) \to \infty$ as $q \to 0$, at a rate depending only on ϵ_1 and ϵ_2. By choosing q sufficiently small (and hence δ sufficiently small) we can arrange that $a(q) \ge 200$, which yields condition 4. □

5. Local estimates for the last segment of the word

In this section we will use the following notation. Let J be as in (10). Let μ be as in (12) and fix $\nu \in (1-\mu, 1/2)$ and $\xi \in (2\nu, 1)$. We treat ν and ξ as fixed throughout this section and do not make dependence on these parameters explicit.

Fix $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in (0,1)$ with $\epsilon_1 > \epsilon_2$. For $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{E}_n^l = \mathcal{E}_n^l(\epsilon_1)$ be the event of Definition 3.3. Also let $\pi_n = \pi_n(\epsilon_1)$ be as in Definition 3.3 and let $\widetilde{\pi}_n = \widetilde{\pi}_n(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ be as in Proposition 4.2. We will also need to consider the following event, which is illustrated in Figure 3.

Definition 5.1. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta > 0$, let $m_n^\delta := \lfloor (1-\delta)n \rfloor$. For $C > 1$, let $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ be the event that the following is true:

$$J > m_n^\delta, \quad \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}\left(X(-m_n^\delta, -1)\right) \leq n^\nu, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\mathcal{N}_\theta\left(X(-m_n^\delta, -1)\right) \in \left[C^{-1}(\delta n)^{1/2}, C(\delta n)^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}, \quad \forall \theta \in \left\{\boxed{\text{H}}, \boxed{\text{C}}\right\}.$$

Recall the definition of the path $Z^n = (U^n, V^n)$ from (9). Roughly speaking, $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ is the event that $Z^n(1-\delta)$ is where we expect it to be when we condition on $\mathcal{E}_n^l$. The reader should note the similarity between the event of Definition 5.1 and the event $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ of (15).



FIGURE 3. An illustration of the path D of (8) on the event $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C) \cap \mathcal{E}_n^l$ for $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, as defined in Definitions 3.3 and 5.1. By Lemma 5.2, the conditional law of the blue part of the path given $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C) \cap \mathcal{E}_n^l$ is mutually absolutely continuous with respect to its conditional law given only $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$. By [GMS15, Theorem 4.1], this latter conditional law converges as $n \to \infty$ (δ fixed) to the conditional law of a correlated Brownian motion $\widehat{Z} = (\widehat{U}, \widehat{V})$ conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time $1-\delta$ and conditioned on the event $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ of (15) in Section 2, defined with $1-\delta$ in place of 1.

The first main result of this subsection is a description of the conditional law of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ given $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C) \cap \mathcal{E}_n^l$ for $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^\xi, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^\xi\right]$, which will allow us to compare this law to the law of a correlated Brownian motion conditioned to stay in the first quadrant using [GMS15, Theorem 4.1].

Proposition 5.2. *Fix $C > 1$. For $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let m_n^δ and let $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ be as in Definition 5.1. For each $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\delta, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$ and each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the conditional law of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ given $\mathcal{E}_n^l \cap \mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ is mutually absolutely continuous with respect to its conditional law given only $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$, with Radon-Nikodym derivative bounded above and below by positive constants depending only on C, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1.*

To complement Lemma 5.3, we have a result which tells us that if C is large, then the event $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ is likely to occur when we condition on $\mathcal{E}_n^l$.

Proposition 5.3. *For each $q \in (0,1)$, there is a $C = C(q, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) > 1$ such that the following is true. For each $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\delta, C, q, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$ and each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C) \,\middle|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

The following result is needed to prove tightness of the conditional law of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$, plus absolute continuity with respect to Lebesgue measure of the law of a subsequential limiting path evaluated at a fixed time, in the next subsection.

Proposition 5.4. *Define $Z^n = (U^n, V^n)$ as in (9). For $\alpha > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widetilde{G}_n(\alpha, \zeta)$ be the event that the following is true. For each $s, t \in [0,1]$ with $|s-t| \le \zeta$, we have $|Z^n(-s) - Z^n(-t)| \le \alpha$. For each $\alpha > 0$ and $q \in (0,1)$, there exists $\zeta = \zeta(q, \alpha, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) > 0$ and $n_* = n_*(\alpha, \zeta, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \ge n_*$ and $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{G}_n(\alpha, \zeta) \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \ge 1 - q.$$

Furthermore, for each $t \in (0,1)$, each $q \in (0,1)$, and each set $A \subset [0,\infty)^2$ with zero Lebesgue measure, there exists $\beta = \beta(t, q, A, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) > 0$ and $n_* = n_*(t, q, A, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \ge n_*$ and $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{dist}(Z^n(t), A) < \beta \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \le q. \tag{52}$$

The idea of the proofs of Propositions 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 is to estimate $\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}\right)$ when $l \in [\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ using the results of [GS15] and Section 4; and to use such estimates, together with Bayes' rule, to obtain statements about the conditional law of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ given $\mathcal{E}_n^l$.

In Section 5.1, we will recall some basic facts about regularly varying functions and some results from [GMS15, GS15] regarding regular variation of certain quantities associated with the word X. In Section 5.2, we will prove a lower bound for the conditional probability of $\mathcal{E}_n^l$ given a realization of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ occurs. In Section 5.3, we will prove our first upper bound for the conditional probability of $\mathcal{E}_n^l$ given $X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1}$, where N_n is a stopping time for the word X, read backward. In Section 5.4, we will use the upper bound of Section 5.3 to deduce two sharper upper bounds for the same probability. In Section 5.5, we will prove a regularity estimate for the last segment of the word when we condition on $\mathcal{E}_n^l$ and a realization of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$. In Section 5.6, we will combine the estimates of the earlier subsections to prove Propositions 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. The reader may wish to read Section 5.6 before the other sections to get an idea for how all of the results of this section fit together.

5.1. **Regular variation.** Here we recall some basic facts about regularly varying functions and some results from [GMS15, GS15] which we will need in the sequel.

Let $\alpha > 0$. Recall that a function $f : [1,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ is called *regularly varying of exponent* α if for each $\lambda > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{f(\lambda t)}{f(t)} = \lambda^{-\alpha}.$$

A function f is called *slowly varying* if f is regularly varying of exponent 0. A function f is regularly varying of exponent α if and only if $f(t) = \psi(t) t^{-\alpha}$, where ψ is slowly varying. See [BGT87] for more on regularly varying functions.

We recall the definition of the exponent μ from (12). The following lemma is taken from [GMS15, Section A.2].

Lemma 5.5. *Let I be the smallest $i \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $X(1,i)$ contains an order. Then the law of I is regularly varying with exponent μ, i.e. there exists a slowly varying function $\psi_0 : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(I > n) = \psi_0(n) n^{-\mu}, \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The following is [GS15, Lemma 4.1].

Lemma 5.6. *Let ψ_0 be the slowly varying function from Lemma 5.5. There is a slowly varying function ψ_2 such that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in [1,n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists\, j \in [n-k, n]_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ such that } X(-j,-1) \text{ contains no orders}) = (1 + o_{k/n}(1)) \psi_0(n) \psi_2(k) (k/n)^\mu.$$

We will make use of the functions ψ_0 and ψ_2 throughout the remainder of this section. The reason why we use the notation ψ_0 and ψ_2 (and not ψ_1) is to be consistent with [GS15] (which also includes another slowly varying function ψ_1 which is not needed for the present paper).

5.2. **Lower bound.** In this subsection we will prove the following lower bound for the conditional probability of $\mathcal{E}_n^l$ given a realization of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ occurs.

Proposition 5.7. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta > 0$ and $C > 1$ let m_n^δ and $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ be as in Definition 5.1. Also let $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and let x be a realization of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ occurs. Let ψ_0 and ψ_2 be the slowly varying functions from Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6. There is an $n_* = n_*(\delta, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$, each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and each realization x as above we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \succeq \psi_0\left(\delta n\right) \psi_2(n^\xi) \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and C.

Proof. Throughout, we assume that n is large enough that $C^{-1}\delta^{1/2} n^{1/2} \geq 100 n^{\xi/2}$. Fix a realization x as in the statement of the proposition and an $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Let $\mathfrak{h}(x)$ and $\mathfrak{c}(x)$ be as in (7) and let

$$\mathfrak{h}_n(x) := \mathfrak{h}(x) - \lfloor 2\epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2} + n^\nu \rfloor.$$

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J_{x,m}^H$ be the smallest $j \geq |x|$ for which $X(-j, -|x|-1)$ contains m hamburgers and let $L_{x,m}^H := d^*\left(X(-J_{x,m}^H, -|x|-1)\right)$. Let $\widetilde{E}_n(x)$ be the event that the following is true.

(1) $J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H \in \left[n - \epsilon_1^{-1} n^\xi, n - n^\xi\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.
(2) $L_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H \in \left[\mathfrak{c}(x) - l - 2n^{\xi/2}, \mathfrak{c}(x) - l - n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.
(3) $\mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{C}}\left(X(-J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H, -1)\right) \leq \mathfrak{c}(x) - l - n^{\xi/2}$.

By [GS15, Proposition 4.4, Assertion 2] (applied with $h = \mathfrak{h}_n(x)$, $c = \mathfrak{c}(x) - l - n^{\xi/2}$, $n - |x| \asymp \delta n$ in place of n, $k \asymp n^\xi$, and $r \asymp n^{\xi/2}$) we can find $n_*^0 = n_*^0(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, C) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_*^0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}_n(x) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \succeq \psi_0(\delta n)\psi_2(n^\xi)\delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-(1-\xi)(1+\mu)}, \tag{53}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and C.

Let $\widetilde{J}_x^C$ be the smallest $j \geq J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H + 1$ for which $X(-j, -J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H - 1)$ contains $\lfloor (1/4) n^{\xi/2} \rfloor$ cheeseburgers. Let $\widetilde{F}_n(x)$ be the event that the following is true.

(1) $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}\left(X(-\widetilde{J}_x^C, -J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H - 1)\right) \geq \epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$.
(2) $\widetilde{J}_x^C - J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H \leq \frac{1}{2} n^\xi$.
(3) $|X(-\widetilde{J}_x^C, -J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H - 1)| \leq \frac{1}{2} n^{\xi/2}$.

The event $\widetilde{F}_n(x)$ is independent from $\widetilde{E}_n(x)$ and by [She11, Theorem 2.5], by possibly increasing n_*^0 we can arrange that for $n \geq n_*^0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{F}_n(x) \,|\, \widetilde{E}_n(x),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \succeq 1, \tag{54}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on ϵ_1.

Let $\widetilde{x}$ be a realization of $X_{-\widetilde{J}_x^C} \dots X_{-|x|-1}$ for which $\widetilde{E}_n(x) \cap \widetilde{F}_n(x)$ occurs and let $\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x}x)$, $\mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x}x)$, and $\mathfrak{c}_f(\widetilde{x}x)$ be as in (7) and Definition 4.1, respectively. Then whenever $X_{-\widetilde{J}_x^C} \dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}x$, we have the following.

(1) $|\widetilde{x}x| \in \left[n - \epsilon_1^{-1} n^\xi, n - \frac{1}{2} n^\xi\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.
(2) Since each of $X(-\widetilde{J}_x^C, -J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H - 1)$ and $X(-J_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}^H, -|x|-1)$ contains no flexible orders, also $\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x})$ contains no flexible orders and $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x}x)) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(x)) \leq n^\nu$.
(3) There are at least $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x})) \geq \epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}$ hamburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x}x)$.

(4) We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x}) &\geq \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J^H_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}, -|x|-1)\right) - \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-\widetilde{J}^C_x, -J^H_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}-1)\right)\\ &\geq -L^H_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)} - \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J^H_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}, -1)\right) - \frac{1}{4}n^{\xi/2} \geq \frac{1}{2}n^{\xi/2},\end{aligned}$$

so there are at least $\frac{1}{2}n^{\xi/2}$ cheeseburger orders to the left of the leftmost flexible order in $\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x}x)$.

(5) By condition 3, we have $\epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2} \leq \mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x}x) \leq \mathfrak{h}(x) - \mathfrak{h}_n(x) + n^\nu + |X(-\widetilde{J}^C_x, -J^H_{x,\mathfrak{h}_n(x)}-1)| \leq 2n^{\xi/2}$.

(6) By our choice of l together with condition 2 in the definition of $\widetilde{E}_n(x)$ and condition 3 in the definition of $\widetilde{F}_n(x)$ we have $0 \leq 1 - \mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x}x) \leq \epsilon_1^{-1}n^{\xi/2}$.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widehat{J}^H_{\widetilde{x}x,m}$ be the smallest $j \geq |\widetilde{x}x|$ for which $X(-j, -|\widetilde{x}x|-1)$ contains m hamburgers, and set $\widehat{L}^H_{\widetilde{x}x,m} := d^*\left(X(J^H_{\widetilde{x}x,m}, -|\widetilde{x}x|-1)\right)$. By observation 4 above, if $X_{-\widetilde{J}^C_x}\dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}x$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\widehat{J}^H_{\widetilde{x}x,\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x}x)} - |\widetilde{x}x|, \widehat{L}^H_{\widetilde{x}x,\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x}x)}\right) &= (n - |\widetilde{x}x|, \mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x}x) - l)\\ \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-\widehat{J}^H_{\widetilde{x}x,\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x}x)}, -|\widetilde{x}x|-1)\right) &\leq \frac{1}{2}n^{\xi/2}\end{aligned}$$

then $J = \widehat{J}^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x}x)}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^l_n$ occurs and every cheeseburger in $X(-\widehat{J}^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x}x)}, -|\widetilde{x}x|-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{x}x)$. By observations 1 and 3 above, the time $\widetilde{J}^C_x = |\widetilde{x}x|$ satisfies the defining conditions of π_n. Therefore $\mathcal{E}^l_n$ occurs. By observations 5 and 6 together with [GS15, Lemma 2.10],

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}^l_n \,|\, \widetilde{E}_n(x),\, \widetilde{F}_n(x),\, X_{-m^\delta_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \succeq n^{-3\xi/2}.$$

By combining this with (53) and (54), we obtain the statement of the proposition. □

5.3. **Upper bound when the tip of the path is in the bulk.** In this subsection, we will prove an upper bound for the conditional probability of the event $\mathcal{E}^l_n$ given a realization of $X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1}$, where N_n is a stopping time for the word X, read backward. This upper bound degenerates near the boundary of the first quadrant, but we will deduce from it various upper bounds without this drawback in Section 5.4 below.

Proposition 5.8. *Fix $\overline{\xi} \in (\xi, 1)$. Let N_n be a stopping time for the word x, read backward, and let x be a realization of $X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1}$ such that $|x| < n - \epsilon_1^{-1}n^\xi$ and $\mathcal{R}(x)$ contains no burgers, at least $n^{\overline{\xi}/2}$ hamburger orders, at least $n^{\overline{\xi}/2}$ cheeseburger orders, and at most n^ν flexible orders. Let $\mathfrak{h}(x)$ and $\mathfrak{c}(x)$ be as in (7) and let*

$$\mathfrak{m}(x) := \mathfrak{h}(x) \wedge \mathfrak{c}(x). \tag{55}$$

Let ψ_0 and ψ_2 be the slowly varying functions from Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6. For each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1}n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}^l_n \,|\, X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \psi_0\left(\mathfrak{m}(x)^2\right)\psi_2(n^\xi)\mathfrak{m}(x)^{-2-2\mu}n^{\xi(\mu-1/2)}.$$

with the implicit constant depending only on $\overline{\xi}$, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1.

Recall the time $\widetilde{\pi}_n = \widetilde{\pi}_n(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ from Proposition 4.2. We will prove Proposition 5.8 by considering the time intervals $[N_n, \widetilde{\pi}_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $[\widetilde{\pi}_n, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ separately; estimating the former using [GS15, Proposition 4.4] and Proposition 4.2; and estimating the latter using [GS15, Proposition 2.2].

Lemma 5.9. *Let $\widetilde{x}$ be a realization of $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n}\dots X_{-1}$ for which $\widetilde{\pi}_n < J$. Let $\mathfrak{c}_f(\widetilde{x})$ and $\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})$ be as in Definition 4.1 and let $\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})$ be as in (7). There are constants $a_0, a_1 > 0$, depending only on ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, each realization $\widetilde{x}$ as in that lemma, and each $l \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}^l_n \,|\, X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n}\dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\right) \preceq \exp\left(-\frac{a_0\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})^2}{n - |\widetilde{x}|} - \frac{a_1|\mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x}) - l|}{(n-|\widetilde{x}|)^{1/2}}\right)\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})^{-3}\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})^{-1+o_{\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})}(1)},$$

with the implicit constants depending only on ϵ_1 and ϵ_2.

Proof. Fix a realization $\widetilde{x}$ as in the statement of the lemma. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J^H_{\widetilde{x},m}$ be the smallest $j \geq |\widetilde{x}|+1$ such that $X(-j,-|\widetilde{x}|-1)$ contains m hamburgers and let $L^H_{\widetilde{x},m} := d^*\left(X(-J^H_{\widetilde{x},m},-1)\right)$.

On the event $\mathcal{E}^l_n$, every cheeseburger in $X(-J,-|\widetilde{x}|-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-|\widetilde{x}|,-1)$. It follows that

$$(J^H_{\widetilde{x},\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})}, L^H_{\widetilde{x},\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})}) = (n, l-\mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x})).$$

By Lemma 4.4 together with the second equation of [GS15, Lemma 2.8] (applied with $m = \mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})$, $k = n-|\widetilde{x}|$, and $R = |l-\mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x})|$), we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}^l_n \,|\, X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n}\dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\right) \\
&\quad= \mathbb{P}\left((J^H_{\widetilde{x},\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})}, L^H_{\widetilde{x},\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})}) = (n, l-\mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x})) \,|\, X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n}\dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\right) \\
&\quad\leq \mathbb{P}\left((J^H_{\widetilde{x},\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})}, L^H_{\widetilde{x},\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})}) = (n, l-\mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x})) \,|\, X_{-|\widetilde{x}|}\dots X_{-1} = \widetilde{x}\right) \mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})^{-1+o_{\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})}(1)} \\
&\quad\preceq \exp\left(-\frac{a_0\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})^2}{n-|\widetilde{x}|} - \frac{a_1|\mathfrak{c}(\widetilde{x})-l|}{(n-|\widetilde{x}|)^{1/2}}\right)\mathfrak{o}(\widetilde{x})^{-3}\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})^{-1+o_{\mathfrak{r}(\widetilde{x})}(1)},
\end{aligned}$$

for constants $a_0, a_1 > 0$ as in the statement of the lemma. □

Fix a small constant $\eta > 0$. In what follows, we let

$$\mathbb{k}^\eta_n := \left\lfloor \log_2\left(\eta n^{(\overline{\xi}-\xi)/2}\right)\right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbb{k}}_n := \left\lfloor \log_2\left(\eta n^{\xi/2}\right)\right\rfloor, \tag{56}$$

be the smallest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $2^k n^{\xi/2} \geq \eta n^{\overline{\xi}/2}$ (with $\overline{\xi}$ as in Proposition 5.8) and the smallest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $2^{-k} \leq n^{-\xi/2}$, respectively.

Lemma 5.10. *Let x be a realization of $X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1}$ as in Proposition 5.8 and define $\mathfrak{h}(x)$, $\mathfrak{c}(x)$, and $\mathfrak{m}(x)$ as in Proposition 5.8. For $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $E^l_n(k)$ be the event that $\pi_n < J$,*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(X(-\pi_n,-1)) \leq 2^k\epsilon_1 n^{\xi/2}, \quad \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{C}}(X(-\pi_n,-1)) - l \leq 2^k n^{\xi/2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{F}}(X(-\pi_n,-1)) \leq 2n^\nu.$$

There is an $\eta > 0$, depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2, such that for each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and each $k \in [1, \mathbb{k}^{2\eta}_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E^l_n(k) \,|\, X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \psi_0\left(\mathfrak{m}(x)^2\right)\psi_2\left(2^{2k}n^\xi\right)\mathfrak{m}(x)^{-2-2\mu}2^{2(\mu+1)k}n^{\xi(\mu+1)} \tag{57}$$

with ψ_0 and ψ_2 as in Section 5.1 and the implicit constants depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2.

Proof. Consider a realization x' of $X_{-\pi_n}\dots X_{-N_n-1}$ for which $E^l_n(k)$ occurs when $X_{-\pi_n}\dots X_{-1} = x'x$. Since $\pi_n < J$, the word $\mathcal{R}(x')$ contains at most $\mathfrak{c}(x)+n^\nu$ cheeseburgers and at most $\mathfrak{h}(x)+n^\nu$ hamburgers. Since $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}(\mathcal{R}(x'x)) - l \leq 2^k n^{\xi/2}$, we have

$$d^*\left(\mathcal{R}(x')\right) \geq \mathfrak{c}(x) - n^\nu - l - 2^k n^{\xi/2}.$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}(\mathcal{R}(x')) + \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(x')) \leq 3n^\nu + l + 2^k n^{\xi/2} \preceq 2^k n^{\xi/2}. \tag{58}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\left|\mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\mathrm{C}}}(\mathcal{R}(x')) - \mathfrak{c}(x)\right| \leq n^\nu + l + 2^k n^{\xi/2} \preceq 2^k n^{\xi/2}. \tag{59}$$

By definition of $E^l_n(k)$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(\mathcal{R}(x'x)) + \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(x'x)) \preceq 2^k n^{\xi/2}, \tag{60}$$

whence

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(\mathcal{R}(x')) + \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(x')) \preceq 2^k n^{\xi/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \left|\mathfrak{h}(x) - \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\mathrm{H}}}(\mathcal{R}(x'))\right| \preceq 2^k n^{\xi/2}. \tag{61}$$

By definition of π_n, we also have

$$0 \le n - |x'x| \le \epsilon_1^{-1} n^{\xi} \preceq n^{\xi} \le 2^k n^{\xi}. \tag{62}$$

The implicit constants above depend only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2.

Since $\pi_n \ge n - \epsilon_1^{-1} n^{\xi/2}$, equations (58), (59), (60), and (61) together imply that $E_n^l(k)$ is contained in the event $E_{n,k',r'}^{\mathfrak{h}(x),\mathfrak{c}(x)}$ of [GS15, Proposition 4.4], defined with $\dots X_{-|x|-2}X_{-|x|-1}$ in place of $\dots X_{-2}X_{-1}$, for $k' \asymp 2^{2k} n^{\xi}$ and $r' \asymp 2^k n^{\xi/2}$ (implicit constants depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2). By [GS15, Proposition 4.4, Assertion 1], if we choose $\eta < (2b)^{-1}$ (say), then whenever $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n^{2\eta}]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\mathfrak{m}(x) \ge n^{\bar{\xi}/2}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_n^l(k) \,|\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \psi_0\left(\mathfrak{m}(x)^2\right) \psi_2\left(2^{2k} n^{\xi}\right) \mathfrak{m}(x)^{-2-2\mu} 2^{2(\mu+1)k} n^{\xi(\mu+1)}.$$

The statement of the lemma follows. □

Lemma 5.11. *Let x be a realization of $X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1}$ as in Proposition 5.8 and define $\mathfrak{h}(x)$, $\mathfrak{c}(x)$, and $\mathfrak{m}(x)$ as in Proposition 5.8. For $k_1, k_3, l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widetilde{E}_n^l(k_1, k_3)$ be the event that $\widetilde{\pi}_n < J \wedge n$ and the following is true:*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{H}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) \le 2^{k_1}(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) n^{\xi/2}, \quad \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{C}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) - l \le 2^{k_1} n^{\xi/2},$$
$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{F}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) \le n^{\nu}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{c}_f\left(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)\right) \le 2^{-k_3} n^{\xi/2}.$$

Let η be chosen as in Lemma 5.11 and let $\Bbbk_n^{\eta}$ and $\widetilde{\Bbbk}_n$ be as in (56) for this choice of η. For each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and each $(k_1, k_3) \in [1, \Bbbk_n^{\eta}]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times [1, \widetilde{\Bbbk}_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}_n^l(k_1, k_3) \,|\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \psi_0\left(\mathfrak{m}(x)^2\right) \psi_2\left(2^{2k_1} n^{\xi}\right) \mathfrak{m}(x)^{-2-2\mu} 2^{2(\mu+1)k_1 - 100k_3} n^{\xi(\mu+1)} \tag{63}$$

with ψ_0 and ψ_2 as in Section 5.1 and the implicit constants depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2.

Proof. Let $E_n^l(k_1 + 1)$ be as in Lemma 5.10 with $k = k_1 + 1$. By condition 2 of Proposition 4.2, if $\widetilde{E}_n^l(k_1, k_3)$ occurs, then $E_n^l(k_1 + 1)$ occurs. By condition 4 of Proposition 4.2, for $(k_1, k_3) \in [1, \Bbbk_n^{\eta}]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times [1, \widetilde{\Bbbk}_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathfrak{c}_f\left(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)\right) \le 2^{-k_3} n^{\xi/2} \,|\, E_n^l(k_1 + 1),\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \left(2^{k_3} \wedge n\right)^{-100}.$$

By combining this with the estimate of Lemma 5.10, we obtain (63). □

Proof of Proposition 5.8. For $k_1, k_2, k_3, l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ be the event that $\widetilde{\pi}_n < J \wedge n$ and the following is true:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) \in \left[2^{k_1 - 1}(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) n^{\xi/2}, 2^{k_1}(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$$
$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) - l \in \left[2^{k_2 - 1} n^{\xi/2}, 2^{k_2} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}},$$
$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) \le 2n^{\nu}, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\mathfrak{c}_f\left(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)\right) \in \left[2^{-k_3} n^{\xi/2}, 2^{k_3 - 1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Also let $\widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, 0, k_3)$ be defined in the same manner as $\widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ above but with $\left[-\epsilon_1^{-1} n^{\xi/2}, n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ in place of $\left[2^{k_2 - 1} n^{\xi/2}, 2^{k_2} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$; and let $\widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, k_2, 0)$ be defined in the same manner as $\widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ above but with $\left[n^{\xi/2}, \infty\right)_{\mathbb{Z}}$ in place of $\left[2^{-k_3} n^{\xi/2}, 2^{-k_3} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Let η be as in Lemma 5.10 and let

$$G_n := \left\{ \sup_{j \in [n - \epsilon_1^{-1} n^{\xi}, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-j, -n + \epsilon_1^{-1} n^{\xi})| \le \frac{\eta}{4} n^{\bar{\xi}/2} \right\} \cap \left\{ \sup_{j \in [n/2, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(X(-j, -1)) \le 2n^{\nu} \right\}.$$

Since $\overline{\xi} > \xi$ and $\nu > 1 - \mu$, [She11, Lemma 3.13] together with [GMS15, Corollary 5.2] implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_n^c \,|\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) = o_n^\infty(n). \tag{64}$$

By condition 1 of Proposition 4.2, on the event $\{\widetilde{\pi}_n < J \wedge n\}$ we always have $n - \widetilde{\pi}_n \le \epsilon_1^{-1} n^\xi \le |x|$. By Lemma 5.9, for $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $(k_1, k_2, k_3) \in [1, \Bbbk_n^\eta]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times [0, \Bbbk_n^\eta]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times [1, \widetilde{\Bbbk}_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, \widehat{E}_n^l(k_1,k_2,k_3),\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \exp\left(-a_0 2^{2k_1} - a_1 2^{k_2}\right) 2^{-3k_1} 2^{(k_1+k_3)(1+o_{k_1+k_3}(1))} n^{-3\xi/2} \tag{65}$$

for positive constants a_0 and a_1 depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. By Lemma 5.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{E}_n^l(k_1,k_2,k_3) \,|\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \\ &\quad \preceq \psi_0\left(\mathfrak{m}(x)^2\right) \psi_2\left(2^{2(k_1 \vee k_2)} n^\xi\right) \mathfrak{m}(x)^{-2-2\mu} 2^{2(\mu+1)(k_1 \vee k_2) - 100k_3} n^{\xi(\mu+1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

If n is chosen sufficiently large (depending only on ϵ_0 and η), $\mathcal{E}_n^l$ occurs for some $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and $\widehat{E}_n^l(k_1,k_2,k_3)$ occurs for some $(k_1,k_2) \notin [1, \Bbbk_n^\eta]_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$, then G_n^c occurs. By (65) and (66), for each small $\alpha > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \cap G_n \,|\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\psi_0\left(\mathfrak{m}(x)^2\right) \psi_2\left(n^\xi\right) \mathfrak{m}(x)^{-2-2\mu} n^{\xi(\mu-1/2)}} \\ &\quad \preceq \sum_{k_1=1}^{\Bbbk_n^\eta} \sum_{k_2=0}^{\Bbbk_n^\eta} \sum_{k_3=0}^{\widetilde{\Bbbk}_n} \frac{\psi_2\left(2^{2(k_1 \vee k_2)} n^\xi\right)}{\psi_2\left(n^\xi\right)} 2^{2(\mu+1)(k_1 \vee k_2) - (2-\alpha)k_1 - (99-\alpha)k_3} \exp\left(-a_0 2^{2k_1} - a_1 2^{k_2}\right) \\ &\quad \preceq \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_2=0}^{\infty} 2^{2(\mu+1+\alpha)(k_1 \vee k_2) - (2-\alpha)k_1} \exp\left(-a_0 2^{2k_1} - a_1 2^{k_2}\right) \\ &\quad \preceq \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_2=k_1}^{\infty} 2^{2(\mu+1+\alpha)k_2} \exp\left(-a_0 2^{2k_1} - a_1 2^{k_2}\right) + \sum_{k_2=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1=k_2}^{\infty} 2^{2(\mu+1+\alpha)k_1} \exp\left(-a_0 2^{2k_1} - a_1 2^{k_2}\right) \\ &\quad \preceq \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-a_0 2^{2k_1}\right) + \sum_{k_2=0}^{\infty} \exp\left(-a_1 2^{k_2}\right) \preceq 1, \end{aligned}$$

with implicit constants depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, ϵ_2, and α. By combining this with (64), we obtain the statement of the proposition. □

We end this subsection by recording the following consequence of the proof of Proposition 5.8, which will be used in Section 5.5 below.

Corollary 5.12. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B > 1$, let*

$$\begin{aligned} H_{n,1}(B) &:= \left\{ B^{-1} n^{\xi/2} \le \mathcal{N}_\theta\left(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)\right) \le B n^{\xi/2} \quad \forall \theta \in \left\{ \boxed{H}, \boxed{C} \right\} \right\} \\ H_{n,2}(B) &:= \left\{ \mathfrak{c}_f\left(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)\right) \ge B^{-1} n^{\xi/2} \right\} \\ H_{n,3}(B) &:= \left\{ n - \widetilde{\pi}_n \ge B^{-1} n^{\xi/2} \right\} \\ F_{\widetilde{\pi}_n} &:= \left\{ \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{F}}\left(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)\right) \le 2n^\nu \right\} \\ H_n(B) &:= \{\widetilde{\pi}_n < J \wedge n\} \cap H_{n,1}(B) \cap H_{n,2}(B) \cap F_{\widetilde{\pi}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $C > 1$ and $q \in (0,1)$. There is a $B > 1$, depending only on C, q, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2 such that the following is true. Let x be a realization of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ occurs (notation as in Definition 5.1). Then for each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_n(B) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \ge 1 - q.$$

Proof. Fix $\alpha > 0$ to be chosen later, depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, ϵ_2, C, and q. Since $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(\mathcal{R}(x)) \le n^\nu$, by [GMS15, Corollary 5.2] we have $\mathbb{P}(F^c_{\widetilde{\pi}_n} \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x) = o_n^\infty(n)$, at a rate depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. Therefore, for each $\delta > 0$ we can find $n_*^0 = n_*^0(\delta, \alpha\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \ge n_*^0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_{\widetilde{\pi}_n} \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \ge 1 - \alpha. \tag{67}$$

For $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$, define the events $\widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ as in the proof of Proposition 5.8. Also let $\Bbbk_n^\eta$ be defined as in (56) with η as in Lemma 5.10. By (65) and (66), for $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $(k_1, k_2, k_3) \in [1, \Bbbk_n^\eta]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times [0, \Bbbk_n^\eta]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times [0, \infty)_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \cap \widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, k_2, k_3) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\psi_0(\delta n)\, \psi_2(n^\xi) \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)}} \\ &\qquad \preceq \frac{\psi_2\left(2^{2(k_1 \vee k_2)} n^\xi\right)}{\psi_2(n^\xi)} \exp\left(-a_0 2^{2k_1} - a_1 2^{k_2}\right) 2^{2(\mu+1)(k_1 \vee k_2) - 2k_1 - 99k_3 + (k_3 + k_1)(o_{k_1+k_3}(1))} \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

for positive constants a_0 and a_1 depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2.

For $(\overline{k}_1, \overline{k}_2, \overline{k}_3) \in \mathbb{N} \times [0, \infty)^2_{\mathbb{Z}}$, let $\mathcal{K}(\overline{k}_1, \overline{k}_2, \overline{k}_3)$ be the set of $(k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \mathbb{N} \times [0, \infty)^2_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which either $k_1 \ge \overline{k}_1$, $k_2 \ge \overline{k}_2$, or $k_3 \ge \overline{k}_3$. By the calculation at the end of the proof of Proposition 5.8, for each $\alpha > 0$ we can find $\overline{k}_1, \overline{k}_2, \overline{k}_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n_*^1 = n_*^1(\delta, \alpha, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \ge n_*^0$ such that for $n \ge n_*^1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \cap \bigcup_{(k_1,k_2,k_3) \in \mathcal{K}(\overline{k}_1, \overline{k}_2, \overline{k}_3)} \widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, k_2, k_3) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \\ &\qquad \preceq \alpha \psi_0(\delta n)\, \psi_2\left(n^\xi\right) \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)} \end{aligned}$$

with the implicit constants depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, ϵ_2, and C. By combining this with Proposition 5.7 and possibly increasing n_*^1, we find that for $n \ge n_*^1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{(k_1,k_2,k_3) \in \mathcal{K}(\overline{k}_1, \overline{k}_2, \overline{k}_3)} \widehat{E}_n^l(k_1, k_2, k_3) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \preceq \alpha.$$

By definition of π_n together with assertion 2 of Proposition 4.2, we always have $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(X(-\widetilde{\pi}_n, -1)) \ge (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) n^{\xi/2}$ on $\mathcal{E}_n^l$. By combining this with (67), we infer that with $B_0 = (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)^{-1} \vee 2^{\overline{k}_1} \vee 2^{\overline{k}_2} \vee 2^{\overline{k}_3}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left((H_{n,1}(B_0) \cap H_{n,2}(B_0))^c \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \preceq \alpha. \tag{69}$$

By Lemma 5.9, for each $\zeta > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, n - \widetilde{\pi}_n \le \zeta n,\, H_{n,1}(B_0) \cap H_{n,2}(B_0) \cap F_{\widetilde{\pi}_n},\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \exp\left(-\frac{a_0}{\zeta}\right) n^{-3\xi/2}$$

with the the constant $a_0 > 0$ and the implicit constant depending only on B_0, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. By Lemma 5.11,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n - \widetilde{\pi}_n \le \zeta n,\, H_{n,1}(B_0) \cap H_{n,2}(B_0) \cap F_{\widetilde{\pi}_n} \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \psi_0(\delta n) \psi_2(n^{\xi/2}) \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-(1-\xi)(1+\mu)}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on B_0, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. By combining this with Proposition 5.7 and Bayes' rule, we find that if we choose ζ sufficiently small (depending on B_0, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2) and set $B := \zeta^{-1} \wedge B_0$, then for $n \ge n_*^1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_n(B)^c \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \alpha.$$

We now obtain the statement of the corollary by choosing n sufficiently large (depending only on $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2$, C, and δ) and α sufficiently small (depending only on $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2$, q, and C). □

5.4. **Stronger upper bounds.** The estimate of Proposition 5.8 is not quite enough to prove Proposition 5.3, as it degenerates when our realization x is such that $(\mathfrak{h}(x), \mathfrak{c}(x))$ is close to the boundary of the first quadrant (i.e. $\mathfrak{m}(x)$ is small). In this subsection we will deduce from Proposition 5.8 two other upper bound which do not have this drawback, one with depends only on $n - |x|$ and one which depends on $\mathfrak{h}(x) \vee \mathfrak{c}(x)$. These two upper bounded will be used in Section 5.6 to prove Proposition 5.3.

We start with the upper bound in terms of $n - |x|$. Note the similarity to the lower bound of Proposition 5.7.

Proposition 5.13. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let N_n be a stopping time for X, read backward. Let ψ_0 and ψ_2 be the slowly varying functions as above. For each $\delta > 0$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\delta, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$; each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$; and each realization x of $X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1}$ such that $|x| \in [(1-2\delta)n, (1-\delta)n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\mathcal{R}(x)$ contains at most n^ν flexible orders, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \psi_0(\delta n)\, \psi_2(n^\xi) \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)} \tag{70}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on ϵ_0 and ϵ_1.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of condition 4 of Proposition 4.2. The idea is to grow a little more of the word backward from time $-N_n$ and argue that with high probability, we soon reach a time for which $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(X(-j,-1)) \wedge \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(X(-j,-1))$ is of order $(\delta n)^{1/2}$. We then condition on the word up to such a time and apply Proposition 5.8.

Fix $\overline{\xi}, \overline{\xi}' \in (\xi, 1)$ with $\overline{\xi} < \overline{\xi}'$ and $\delta > 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\Bbbk_n := \lfloor \log_2(\delta n^{1-\overline{\xi}'}) \rfloor$$

be the largest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $2^{-k/2}(\delta n)^{1/2} \geq n^{\overline{\xi}'/2}$.

Let $m_n^0 = N_n$ and for $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, inductively define $m_n^k := \lfloor 2^{-k-1}\delta n \rfloor + m_n^{k-1}$. For $\zeta > 0$ and $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, let $E_n^k(\zeta)$ be the event that

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}\left(X(-m_n^k, -m_n^{k-1} - 1)\right) \wedge \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}\left(X(-m_n^k, -m_n^{k-1} - 1)\right) \geq \zeta 2^{-k/2}(\delta n)^{1/2}.$$

Let $K_n(\zeta)$ be the minimum of $\Bbbk_n + 1$ and the smallest $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which $E_n^k(\zeta)$ occurs and let $\widetilde{N}_n(\zeta) := m_n^{K_n(\zeta)}$. Note that if $N_n \leq (1-\delta)n$, then

$$\widetilde{N}_n(\zeta) \leq N_n + \sum_{k=1}^{\Bbbk_n} 2^{-k-1}\delta n \leq (1 - \delta/2)n.$$

By [She11, Theorem 2.5], for each $s \in (0,1)$, we can find an $\zeta > 0$ (depending only on s) and an $n_*^0 = n_*^0(\zeta, s, \delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_*^0$ and $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_n^k(\zeta)\right) \geq 1 - s.$$

Since the events $\{E_n^k(\zeta)\}$ are independent from each other and from $X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1}$, for such a choice of ζ we have for $n \geq n_*^0$, $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and each realization x as in the statement of the proposition that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(K_n(\zeta) \geq k \,|\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \leq s^k. \tag{71}$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(K_n(\zeta) = \Bbbk_n + 1 \,|\, X_{-N_n} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \leq s^{\Bbbk_n} \leq \left(\delta n^{1-\overline{\xi}'}\right)^{-R} \tag{72}$$

where the exponent $R > 0$ can be made as large as we like by choosing s (and hence also ζ) sufficiently small, independently of δ, n, and x.

Let

$$F_n^k := \left\{\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}\left(X(-m_n^k, -1)\right) \leq 2n^\nu\right\} \tag{73}$$

with ν defined as in the beginning of this section. By [GMS15, Corollary 5.2], for any realization x as in the statement of the proposition we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{\Bbbk_n} F_n^k \,|\, X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) = o_n^\infty(n) \tag{74}$$

at a rate depending only on p.

On the event $\{K_n(\zeta) = k\}$ for $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(X(-N_n(\zeta), -1)) \wedge \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}(X(-N_n(\zeta), -1)) \geq \zeta 2^{-k/2}(\delta n)^{1/2}.$$

Let $n_*^1 = n_*^1(\zeta, s, \delta, \overline{\xi}', \overline{\xi}) \geq n_*^0$ be chosen so that $\zeta n^{\overline{\xi}'/2} \geq n^{\overline{\xi}'/2}$ for $n \geq n_*^1$. By Proposition 5.8 (applied with $\widetilde{N}_n(\zeta)$ in place of N_n) and our choice of $\Bbbk_n$, by possibly increasing n_*^1 we can arrange that for each $n \geq n_*^1$, each $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and each l and x as in the statement of the proposition we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, K_n(\zeta) = k,\, F_n^k,\, X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right)\\ &\quad\preceq \psi_0\left(2^{-k}\delta n\right)\psi_2(n^{\xi/2})2^{2k(1+\mu)}\delta^{-1-\mu}n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)}\end{aligned}$$

with the implicit constants depending only on ζ, $\overline{\xi}, \overline{\xi}'$, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1. By combining this with (71), we infer

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l,\, K_n(\zeta) = k,\, F_n^k \,|\, X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right)\\ &\quad\preceq \psi_0\left(2^{-k}\delta n\right)\psi_2(n^{\xi/2})s^k 2^{2k(1+\mu)}\delta^{-1-\mu}n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)}.\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

By (72), (74), and (75), we find that if we choose s sufficiently small, depending only on $\overline{\xi}$ (and ζ sufficiently small depending on s), then there exists $q = q(s) \in (0,1)$ and $n_*^2 = n_*^2(s, \zeta, \delta, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^1$ such that for $n \geq n_*^2$ and any l and x as in the statement of the proposition, it holds for each $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l,\, K_n(\zeta) = k \,|\, X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq q^k \psi_0\left(2^{-k}\delta n\right)\psi_2(n^{\xi/2})\delta^{-1-\mu}n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)},$$

with the implicit constants depending only on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, s, and ζ; and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(k_*^n(\zeta) = \Bbbk_n + 1 \,|\, X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \leq \delta^{-1-\mu}n^{-100}.$$

By summing over all $k \in [1, \Bbbk_n + 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we obtain the statement of the proposition for $n \geq n_*^2$. □

Next we will prove a version of Lemma 5.8 with $\mathfrak{h}(x) \vee \mathfrak{c}(x)$ in place of $\mathfrak{h}(x) \wedge \mathfrak{c}(x)$, which will help us rule out the possibility that $D(X(-N_n, -1))$ is far from the origin.

Proposition 5.14. *Fix $\overline{\xi} \in (\xi, 1)$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let N_n be a stopping time for the word X, read backward. Let*

$$\mathfrak{M}(x) := \mathfrak{h}(x) \vee \mathfrak{c}(x).$$

There exists $n_* = n_*(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$; each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1}n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$; and each realization x of $X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1}$ such that $|x| < n - \epsilon_1^{-1}n^{\xi}$, $\mathfrak{M}(x) \geq n^{\overline{\xi}/2}$, and $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{F}}(\mathcal{R}(x)) \leq n^\nu$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, X_{-N_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \psi_0\left(\mathfrak{M}(x)^2\right)\psi_2(n^\xi)\mathfrak{M}(x)^{-2-2\mu}n^{\xi(\mu-1/2)} \tag{76}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on ϵ_0 and ϵ_1.

Proof. Fix a realization x as in the statement of the proposition. Suppose $\mathfrak{h}(x) \geq \mathfrak{c}(x)$, so that $\mathfrak{M}(x) = \mathfrak{h}(x) \geq n^{\overline{\xi}/2}$ (the case where we have the reverse inequality is treated similarly). For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J_{x,m}^H$ be the smallest $j \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $X(-j, -|x| - 1)$ contains m hamburgers and let $L_{x,m}^H := d^*\left(X(-J_{x,m}^H, -|x| - 1)\right)$. Let $h_x^0 = 0$ and for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, inductively define $h_x^k := \lfloor 2^{-k}\mathfrak{h}(x)\rfloor + h_x^{k-1}$. For $\zeta > 0$, let

$$E_x^k := \left\{\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-J_{x,h_x^k}^H, -J_{x,h_x^k}^H - 1)\right) \geq 2^{-k}\mathfrak{h}(x)\right\}.$$

The proposition is proven by choosing $\zeta > 0$ small and stopping at (roughly speaking) the smallest k for which E_x^k occurs. The rest of the argument is very similar to the proofs of Propositions 4.2 and 5.13, so we omit the details. □

5.5. **Regularity for the last segment of the word.** In this subsection we will prove a regularity result for the last segment of the word conditioned on the event $\mathcal{E}_n^l$. This result is needed in the proof of Proposition 5.4 to show that it is unlikely that the path Z^n of (9) moves a large amount during the time interval $[1-\delta, 1]$ (i.e. that the purple segment in Figure 3 has huge diameter) when we condition on $\mathcal{E}_n^l$.

Proposition 5.15. *Let m_n^δ and $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ be as in Definition 5.1. For each $C > 1$ and each $q \in (0,1)$, there is an $A > 0$, depending only on C, q, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1 such that for each $\delta > 0$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\delta, C, q, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$, each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and each realization x of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ occurs, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{j \in [m_n^\delta + 1, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-j, -m_n^\delta - 1)| \leq A(\delta n)^{1/2} \,\middle|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l \right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Lemma 5.16. *Fix $C > 1$. Also let $\delta > 0$ and let x be a realization of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ occurs. For $A > 0$, let*

$$G_n(x; A) := \left\{ \sup_{j \in [|x|+1, \widetilde{\pi}_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-j, -|x| - 1)| \leq A(\delta n)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

For $B > 1$, let $H_n(B)$ be the event of Corollary 5.12. There exists $B_0 > 0$ such that for each $q \in (0,1)$ and each $B \geq B_0$, there exists $A = A(q, B, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ such that for each $\delta > 0$, we can find $n_* = n_*(\delta, A, B, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$ and each realization x as above, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_n(x; A) \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x \right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Proof. Fix a realization x as in the statement of the lemma. By Proposition 5.7 and Corollary 5.12, we can find $B > 1$ such that for each $\delta > 0$, there exists and $n_*^0 = n_*^0(\delta, B, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_*^0$ and $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_n(B) \cap \mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x \right) \succeq \psi_0(\delta n) \psi_2(n^\xi) \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)}$$

with the implicit constants depending only on B, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. By Lemma 5.9,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x \right) \preceq n^{-3\xi/2}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on B. It follows that for $n \geq n_*^0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(H_n(B) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x \right) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(H_n(B) \cap \mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x \right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x \right)} \\ &\succeq \psi_0(\delta n) \psi_2(n^\xi) \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-(1-\xi)(1+\mu)}. \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Henceforth fix $B > 1$ for which (77) holds.

For $\widehat{B} > 1$, let $\widehat{E}_n(x; \widehat{B})$ be the event that there is a $j \in [n+1, n+n^\xi]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that the following is true:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{H}}(X(-j, -|x| - 1)) \in \left[\mathfrak{h}(x) - \widehat{B} n^{\xi/2}, \mathfrak{h}(x) + \widehat{B} n^{\xi/2} \right]_{\mathbb{Z}}, \\ &\mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{C}}(X(-j, -|x| - 1)) \in \left[\mathfrak{c}(x) - \widehat{B} n^{\xi/2}, \mathfrak{c}(x) + \widehat{B} n^{\xi/2} \right]_{\mathbb{Z}}, \\ &\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{H}}}(X(-j, -|x| - 1)) + \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}(X(-j, -|x| - 1)) \leq \widehat{B} n^{\xi/2}, \quad \text{and} \\ &\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(X(-j, -|x| - 1)) + \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{F}}}(X(-j, -|x| - 1)) \leq \widehat{B} n^{\xi/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

We claim that there exists $\widehat{B} > 1$, depending only on B, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2 such that if n is chosen sufficiently large, then for any realization x' of $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-m_n^\delta - 1}$ for which $H_n(B)$ occurs when $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1} = x'x$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{E}_n(x; \widehat{B}) \,|\, X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n} \dots X_{-1} = x'x \right) \succeq 1, \tag{79}$$

with the implicit constant depending only on B, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. To see this, let $\widehat{F}_n(x'x) = \widehat{F}_n(x'x; B')$ be the event that

$$\sup_{j\in[|x'x|,n+n^\xi]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-j,-|x'x|-1)| \le 2Bn^{\xi/2}, \quad \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{H}}\big(X(-n-n^\xi,-|x'x|-1)\big) \ge Bn^{\xi/2}+2n^\nu, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{C}}\big(X(-n-n^\xi,-|x'x|-1)\big) \le B^{-1}n^{\xi/2}-2n^\nu.$$

By condition 1 of Proposition 4.2, we have $|x'x| \ge n-\epsilon_1^{-1}n^\xi$. By [She11, Theorem 2.5], it follows that we can find $n_*^1 = n_*^1(\delta,B,C,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2) \ge n_*^0$ such that for each $n \ge n_*^1$ and each choice of realizations x' and x as above, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{F}_n(x'x) \,|\, X_{-|x'x|}\dots X_{-1} = x'x\right) \succeq 1,$$

with the implicit constant depending only on B and ϵ_1. By definition of $H_n(B)$, if $\widehat{F}_n(x'x)$ occurs and $X_{-|x'x|}\dots X_{-1} = x'x$, then $J \le n+n^\xi$ and each cheeseburger in $X(-n-n^\xi,-|x'x|-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-|x'x|,-1)$. By condition 3 of Proposition 4.2, we therefore have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{F}_n(x'x) \,|\, X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n}\dots X_{-1} = x'x\right) \succeq 1,$$

with the implicit constant depending only on B and ϵ_1. On the other hand, the definition of $H_n(B)$ implies that $\mathcal{R}(x')$ has at most $Bn^{\xi/2}+n^\nu$ hamburger orders plus flexible orders; and between $\mathfrak{h}(x)-Bn^{\xi/2}$ and $\mathfrak{h}(x)+n^\nu$ hamburgers. Similar statements hold for cheeseburger orders and hamburger orders. Consequently, if n is chosen sufficiently large (depending only on B) then if $\widehat{F}_n(x'x)$ occurs and $X_{-\widetilde{\pi}_n}\dots X_{-1} = x'x$, we have that $\widehat{E}_n(x;\widehat{B})$ occurs for $\widehat{B}$ slightly larger than $2B+1$. This yields (79).

Now fix $\alpha > 0$ to be chosen later, depending only on q, B, and C. By [GS15, Proposition 4.4, Assertion 3] we can find $A > 0$, depending only on α, B, and C, such that for each $\delta > 0$ there exists $n_*^2 = n_*^2(\alpha,\delta,B,C,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2) \ge n_*^1$ such that for $n \ge n_*^2$ and each realization x as in the statement of the lemma, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_n(x;A)^c \,|\, \widehat{E}_n(x;\widehat{B}),\, X_{-m_n^\delta}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \le \alpha.$$

By [GS15, Proposition 4.4, Assertion 1],

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_n(x;A)^c \cap \widehat{E}_n(x;\widehat{B}) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq \alpha\psi_0(\delta n)\psi_2(n^\xi)\delta^{-1-\mu}n^{-(1-\xi)(1+\mu)} \tag{80}$$

with the implicit constants depending only $\widehat{B}$ and C.

By combining (77), (79) and (80), we infer that for $n \ge n_*^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(G_n(x;A)^c \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta}\dots X_{-1} = x\right)\\ &\quad\le \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(G_n(x;A)^c \cap \widehat{E}_n(x;\widehat{B}) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta}\dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{E}_n(x;\widehat{B}) \,|\, G_n(x;A)^c,\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta}\dots X_{-1} = x\right)\mathbb{P}\left(H_n(B) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta}\dots X_{-1} = x\right)} \preceq \alpha,\end{aligned}$$

with the implicit constants depending only on B, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. We now conclude by choosing α smaller than q divided by this implicit constant. □

Proof of Proposition 5.15. By Corollary 5.12, we can find $B = B(C,\alpha,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) > 0$ and $n_*^0 = n_*^0(\delta,C,\alpha,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \ge n_*^0$ and x, l as in the statement of the proposition, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_n(B) \,\middle|\, X_{-m_n^\delta}\dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \ge 1-q/2, \tag{81}$$

with $H_n(B)$ as in Corollary 5.12. Henceforth fix such a B.

Fix $\alpha > 0$ to be determined later depending on C and q. By Lemma 5.16, we can find $A_0 > 0$, depending only on B, C, α, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1 and $n_*^1 = n_*^1(\delta,C,\alpha,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) \ge n_*^0$ such that for $n \ge n_*^1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{j\in[m_n^\delta+1,\widetilde{\pi}_n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-j,-|x|-1)| \le A_0(\delta n)^{1/2} \,\middle|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) \ge 1-\alpha.$$

By definition of $\widetilde{\pi}_n$, we have $0 \leq n - \widetilde{\pi}_n \leq \epsilon_1^{-1} n^{\xi/2}$ on $\mathcal{E}_n^l$. By [She11, Lemma 3.13], for any given $A \geq A_0$ we can find $n_*^2 = n_*^2(\delta, A, C, \alpha, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^2$ such that for $n \geq n_*^2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{G}_n(x; A) \,\middle|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \geq 1 - 2\alpha, \tag{82}$$

where

$$\widehat{G}_n(x; A) := \left\{ \sup_{j \in [|x|+1, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-j, -|x| - 1)| \leq A(\delta n)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

By (81),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{G}_n(x; A)^c \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{G}_n(x; A)^c \cap H_n(B) \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) + \frac{q}{2}. \tag{83}$$

By Bayes' rule and (82),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{G}_n(x; A)^c \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \\
&\quad = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, \widehat{G}_n(x; A)^c,\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{G}_n(x; A)^c \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)} \\
&\quad \leq \frac{2\alpha \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, \widehat{G}_n(x; A)^c,\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

By Lemma 5.9,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, \widehat{G}_n(x; A)^c,\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \preceq n^{-3\xi/2}$$

with the implicit constants depending only on B, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. By assertion 3 of Proposition 4.2 together with [GS15, Lemma 2.9], we can find $n_*^3(\delta, A, C, \alpha, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^2$ such that for $n \geq n_*^3$ and x, l as in the statement of the proposition,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \succeq n^{-3\xi/2},$$

with the implicit constants depending only on B, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. By (84),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{G}_n(x; A)^c \,|\, H_n(B),\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \preceq \alpha,$$

with the implicit constants depending only on B, C, ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2. By choosing α sufficiently small relative to q (and hence A sufficiently large) and combining this with (83), we obtain the statement of the proposition. □

5.6. **Proofs of Propositions 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.** In this subsection we combine the earlier results of this section to prove the main results stated at the beginning of the section. First we deduce Proposition 5.2 from Propositions 5.7 and 5.8.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. By Propositions 5.7 and 5.8, we can find $n_*^0 = n_*^0(\delta, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*^0$, each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and any two realizations x and x' of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ occurs,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \asymp \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x'\right)$$

with the implicit constants depending only on C, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1. The statement of the proposition now follows from Bayes' rule. □

Next we deduce Proposition 5.3 from Propositions 5.7, 5.13, and 5.14.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. Throughout the proof, we require implicit constants to depend only on ϵ_0 and ϵ_1. Fix $q \in (0,1)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta > 0$, let $m_n^\delta := \lfloor (1-\delta)n \rfloor$, as in Definition 5.1. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$F_n := \left\{ \sup_{j \in [n/2, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(X(-j,-1)) \le n^\nu \right\}.$$

By [GMS15, Corollary 5.2], we have $\mathbb{P}(F_n) = o_n^\infty(n)$, so for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (depending only on ϵ_0 and ϵ_1) it holds for each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F_n \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \ge 1 - \frac{q}{3}. \tag{85}$$

Now fix $\alpha > 0$ to be chosen later, depending only on q, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1. For $\zeta > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\underline{G}_n^\delta(\zeta) := F_n \cap \{J > m_n^\delta\} \cap \left\{ \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}\left(X(-m_n^\delta, -1)\right) \wedge \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-m_n^\delta, -1)\right) \le \zeta(\delta n)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

By [GMS15, Theorem 4.1], we can find $\zeta > 0$, depending only on α, such that for each $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ there exists $n_*^0 = n_*^0(\delta, \alpha, \zeta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \ge n_*^0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{G}_n^\delta(\zeta) \,|\, \underline{G}_n^\delta(1)\right) \le \alpha, \qquad \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{G}_n^\delta(1) \setminus \underline{G}_n^\delta(1/2) \,|\, \underline{G}_n^\delta(1)\right) \succeq 1.$$

By Proposition 5.13, we can find $n_*^1(\delta, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \ge n_*^0$ such that for $n \ge n_*^1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, \underline{G}_n^\delta(\zeta)\right) \preceq \psi_0(\delta n)\, \psi_2(n^\xi) \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)}.$$

By combining this with Proposition 5.7, possibly increasing n_*^1, and applying Bayes' rule, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{G}_n^\delta(\zeta) \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) &\le \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{G}_n^\delta(\zeta) \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l \cap \underline{G}_n^\delta(1)\right) \\ &\le \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, \underline{G}_n^\delta(\zeta)\right) \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{G}_n^\delta(\zeta) \,|\, \underline{G}_n^\delta(1)\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, \underline{G}_n^\delta(1) \setminus \underline{G}_n^\delta(1/2)\right) \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{G}_n^\delta(1) \setminus \underline{G}_n^\delta(1/2) \,|\, \underline{G}_n^\delta(1)\right)} \preceq \alpha. \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

By choosing α sufficiently small, depending only on q, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1 (and hence ζ sufficiently small), we can arrange that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{G}_n^\delta(\zeta) \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \le \frac{q}{3}. \tag{87}$$

To ensure that the word $X(-m_n^\delta, -1)$ does not contain too many orders when we condition on $\mathcal{E}_n^l$, for $C > 1$ define

$$\overline{G}_n^\delta(C) := F_n \cap \left\{ J > m_n^\delta, \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}\left(X(-m_n^\delta, -1)\right) \vee \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}\left(X(-m_n^\delta, -1)\right) \ge C(\delta n)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

By Proposition 5.14, for sufficiently large n (depending only on δ, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n^l \,|\, \overline{G}_n^\delta(C)\right) \preceq \psi_0\left(C^2 \delta n\right) \psi_2(n^\xi) C^{-2-2\mu} \delta^{-1-\mu} n^{-1-\mu+\xi(\mu-1/2)}.$$

By the same argument used in (86), we can find $n_*^2 = n_*^2(\delta, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \ge n_*^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\overline{G}_n^\delta(C) \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \preceq C^{-2-2\mu+o_C(1)}.$$

By combining this with (85) and (87) and choosing C sufficiently large (depending only on q, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1), we obtain the statement of the proposition with $C \vee \zeta^{-1}$ in place of C and an appropriate choice of $n_* \ge n_*^1 \vee n_*^2$. □

Finally, we prove Proposition 5.4 using Propositions 5.2, 5.3, and 5.15.

Proof of Proposition 5.4. Let m_n^δ and $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ be as in Definition 5.1. By Lemma 5.3 together with [GMS15, Lemma 2.8], we can find $C = C(q, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ such that for each $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists $n_*^0 = n_*^0(C, q, \delta, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ such that for $n \geq n_*^0$ and each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C) \,\middle|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \geq 1 - q. \tag{88}$$

By Proposition 5.15, there is an $A > 0$, depending only on C, q, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1 such that for each $\delta > 0$, there exists $n_*^1 = n_*^1(\delta, C, q, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^0$ such that for each $n \geq n_*^1$, each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and each realization x of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ occurs, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{j \in [m_n^\delta + 1, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-j, -m_n^\delta - 1)| \leq A(\delta n)^{1/2} \,\middle|\, X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \geq 1 - q. \tag{89}$$

Henceforth assume we have chosen δ in such a way that $A\delta^{1/2} \leq \alpha/2$.

By Proposition 5.2, by possibly increasing n_*^1 we can arrange that for each l as in the statement of the lemma, the conditional law of $X_{-m_n^\delta} \dots X_{-1}$ given $\mathcal{E}_n^l \cap \mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ is mutually absolutely continuous with respect to its conditional law given only $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$, with Radon-Nikodym derivative bounded above and below by positive constants depending only on C, ϵ_0, and ϵ_1.

By [GMS15, Theorem 4.1], the conditional laws of $Z^n(-\cdot)|_{[0,1-\delta]}$ given $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ converge (in the uniform topology) as $n \to \infty$ to the law of a correlated Brownian motion $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time $1-\delta$ and satisfy $\widehat{Z}^\delta(1-\delta) \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2}\right]^2$ (see Section 2.1 for a precise definition of this conditioned Brownian motion). Since $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ is a.s. continuous, it follows that we can find $\zeta > 0$, depending only on $\delta, C, q, \alpha, \epsilon_0$, and ϵ_1 and $n_*^2 = n_*^2(\delta, C, q, \alpha, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^1$ such that for $n \geq n_*^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{G}_n^\delta(\alpha, \zeta) \,|\, \mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C) \cap \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \geq 1 - q \tag{90}$$

where $\widetilde{G}_n^\delta(\alpha, \zeta)$ is the event that for each $s, t \in [0, 1-\delta]$ with $|s-t| \leq \zeta$, we have $|Z^n(-s) - Z^n(-t)| \leq \alpha/2$.

If $\widetilde{G}_n^\delta(\alpha, \zeta)$ occurs and the event of (89) occurs, then $\widetilde{G}_n(\alpha, \zeta)$ occurs. It now follows from (88), (89), and (90) that for $n \geq n_*^2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{G}_n(\alpha, \zeta) \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \geq (1 - q)(1 - 2q).$$

Since q is arbitrary this proves the first statement of the lemma.

To obtain the second statement of the proposition, fix $t, q \in (0, 1)$ and an open set $A \subset [0, \infty)^2$ with zero Lebesgue measure. Suppose we have chosen C as above for our given choice of q, $1 - \delta > t$, and n_*^1 as above for this choice of δ and C. Since the law of $\widehat{Z}^\delta(t)$ (as defined just above) has a bounded density with respect to Lebesgue measure (see [Shi85, Section 3.2] for an explicit formula for this density), for each $q' \in (0, q]$, we can find $\beta = \beta(t, q', C, \delta)$ such that with $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)$ as in (27), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{Z}^\delta(t) \in B_{2\beta}(A) \,|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)\right) \leq q'.$$

By [GMS15, Theorem 4.1], the conditional law of $Z^n(t)$ given $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ converges as $n \to \infty$ to the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}^\delta(t)$ given $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)$. Therefore, if we choose q' smaller than $q/2$ times the reciprocal of the implicit constant in Proposition 5.2, then we can find $n_*^3 = n_*^3(\delta, C, t, q, A, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^1$ such that (52) holds for each $n \geq n_*^3$ and $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. □

6. Conclusion of the proofs

In this section we will combine the results of the previous subsections to prove our main results, Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.11.

We will use the following notation. Let J be as in (10) and let μ be as in (12). Fix $\nu \in (1 - \mu, 1/2)$ and $\xi \in (2\nu, 1)$.

We recall the definitions of $Z^n = (U^n, V^n)$ and of $Z = (U, V)$ from Section 1.1. We also recall the definitions of the event $\mathcal{E}_n^l(\epsilon_1)$ for $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $n, l \in \mathbb{N}$ from Definition 3.3; and the event $\mathcal{G}_n' = \mathcal{G}_n'(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ from Lemma 3.5. For $\epsilon_0 > 0$, let $\iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)$ be defined as in Section 3.1.

This section is structured as follows. In Section 6.1, we will prove tightness of the conditional laws of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$. In Section 6.2, we will prove a scaling limit result conditioned on the event $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_n^l$ of Definition 3.3, plus several regularity conditions, for l at distance of order $n^{1/2}$ from 0 (rather than of order $n^{\xi/2}$, as was considered in Section 5). In Section 6.3, we will prove that if we condition on $\mathcal{E}_n^l$ for $l \asymp n^{\xi/2}$, then with high conditional probability there is a $j \in [1,n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $X_{-j} = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $-\phi(-j) - j$ a little bit less than n, and $|X(\phi(-j), -j)| \asymp n^{1/2}$ with the property that the event of Section 6.2 occurs with $X_{\phi(-j)} \dots X_{-j}$ in place of $X_{-n} \dots X_{-1}$. In Section 6.4, we will deduce Theorem 1.8 from the results of the preceding subsections together with the results of Section 3 and Lemma 2.2 from Appendix 2. In Section 6.5, we will complete the proof of Theorem 1.11.

6.1. **Tightness.** In this subsection we establish tightness of the conditional law of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$.

Proposition 6.1. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the family of conditional laws of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$ is tight in the topology of uniform convergence. Furthermore, if $\widetilde{Z}$ is a path whose law is a weak subsequential limit of the conditional laws of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$, then for each $t \in (0,2)$, the law of $\widetilde{Z}(t)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure on $[0,\infty)^2$ (so in particular $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Z}(t) \in (0,\infty)^2) = 1$).*

Proof. For $\zeta > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $G_n^k(\zeta)$ be the event that the following is true. For each $s,t \in [0,2]$ with $|s-t| \le \zeta$, we have $|Z^n(s) - Z^n(t)| \le 2^{-k}$. By the Arzéla-Ascoli theorem, to prove tightness it suffices to find for each $q \in (0,1)$ a sequence $\zeta_k \to 0$, independent of n, such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^k(\zeta_k)\right) \ge 1 - q. \tag{91}$$

To this end, suppose given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \in (0,1)$. Also fix $q_k' > 0$ to be determined later, depending only on q and k. By Lemma 3.5, we can find $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 \in (0,1)$ depending only on q_k' and $n_*^0 = n_*^0(q_k') \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \ge n_*^0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{G}_n' \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) \ge 1 - q_k'. \tag{92}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_n' = \mathcal{G}_n'(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ is defined as in Lemma 3.5.

By Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 5.4, we can find $\zeta_k \in \mathbb{N}$, depending on ϵ_0, ϵ_1, k, and q_k'; and $n_*^1 = n_*^1(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_2, k, q_k') \ge n_*^0$ such that for each $n \ge n_*^1$ and each (m,l) as above, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{G}_n^k(\zeta_k) \,|\, \mathcal{G}_n'\right) \ge 1 - q_k' \tag{93}$$

where $\widetilde{G}_n^k(\zeta_k)$ is the event that $|Z^n(-s) - Z^n(-t)| \le 2^{-k-1}$ whenever $s,t \in [\phi(\iota_0^n)/n, \iota_0^n/n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $|s-t| \le \zeta_k$.

On the event $\mathcal{G}_n'$, we have $|\phi(\iota_0^n)| \le n^{\xi/2}$ and $n - \iota_0^n \le n^{\xi/2}$. By [She11, Lemma 3.13] together with [GMS15, Proposition 2.13], we can find $n_*^2 = n_*^2(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_2, k, q_k')$ such that the conditional probability given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$ that $\mathcal{G}_n'(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ occurs and

$$\left(\sup_{j \in [1, \phi(\iota_0^n)]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(1,j)|\right) \vee \left(\sup_{j \in [\iota_0^n, 2n]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(1,j)|\right) \ge 2^{-k-1} n^{1/2} \tag{94}$$

is at most q_k'. If (94) does not hold and $\widetilde{G}_n^k(\zeta_k)$ occurs, then $G_n^k(\zeta_k)$ occurs. Hence (92) and (93) imply that for $n \ge n_*^2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_n^k(\zeta_k) \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) \ge 1 - (1 - q_k')^2 - q_k'.$$

Choose q_k' sufficiently small that this quantity is at least $1 - q2^{-k}$. Since there are only finitely many $n \le n_*^2$, by shrinking ζ_k we can arrange that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_n^k(\zeta_k) \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) \ge 1 - q2^{-k}, \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus (91) holds.

To obtain the last statement, fix a weak subsequential limit of the conditional laws of Z^n given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$, a time $t \in (0,2)$, and an open set $A \subset [0,\infty)^2$ with zero Lebesgue measure. Let $\widetilde{Z}$ be distributed according to our given limiting law. Choose $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ and $n_*^0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (93) holds with q in place of q_k'. Then choose $\beta = \beta(q,t,A,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) > 0$ and $n_*^1 = n_*^1(q,t,A,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) \geq n_*^0$ such that (52) of Proposition 5.4 holds with 2β in place of β and $t/2$ in place of t. Finally, use [She11, Lemma 3.13] to choose $n_*^2 = n_*^2(q,t,\beta,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) \geq n_*^1$ such that for $n \geq n_*^2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \in [t - n^{\xi-1}, t+n^{\xi-1}]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |Z^n(s) - Z^n(t)| > \beta \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset \right) \leq q.$$

Then for $n \geq n_*^2$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{dist}(Z^n(t), A) < \beta \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) \leq 3q. \tag{95}$$

Since q is arbitrary, $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Z}(t) \in A) = 0$. □

6.2. **Convergence conditioned on an exit position at macroscopic distance from 0.** In this section we will define a regularized version of the event $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_n^l$ of Definition 3.3 for $l \asymp n^{1/2}$, which we call $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)$. Roughly speaking, we will then prove the following. Suppose we fix $z_1, z_2 \in (0,\infty)^2$ and $0 < s_1 < s_2 < 1$. Then for sufficiently large n and sufficiently small α, the conditional law of $Z^n|_{[s_1,s_2]}$ given $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)$ and the event that $Z^n(s_1) \approx z_1$ and $Z^n(s_2) \approx z_2$ is close to the law of a Brownian bridge from z_1 to z_2 conditioned to stay in the first quadrant (see Proposition 6.3 below for a precise statement). This statement together with Lemma 2.2 will eventually be used to identify the law of a subsequential limit of the conditional laws of Z^n given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$.

We now proceed to define our events. We recommend that the reader consult Figure 4 for an illustration before reading the formal definition of the events.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in (1/2,1)$, and $\alpha > 0$ let

$$\rho_n^\alpha = \rho_n^\alpha(t) := J \wedge n \wedge \inf\left\{ j \geq tn \,:\, \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(X(-j,-1)) \leq (\alpha n)^{1/2} \right\}. \tag{96}$$

Let

$$O_n^\alpha = O_n^\alpha(t) := \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(X(-\rho_n^\alpha(t),-1)) + \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(X(-\rho_n^\alpha(t),-1)) + 1, \quad Q_n^\alpha = Q_n^\alpha(t) := \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}(X(-\rho_n^\alpha(t),-1)).$$

Also let

$$\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha = \widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha(t) := \lfloor (1-t)n \rfloor \wedge \sup\left\{ j \geq 1 \,:\, \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(X(-j,-1)) \geq (\alpha n)^{1/2} \right\}. \tag{97}$$

For $t \in (1/2,1)$, $\alpha > 0$, and $R > 1$, let $G_n(\alpha) = G_n(\alpha;t,R)$ be the event that the following is true.

1. $J > tn$.
2. $R^{-1} n^{1/2} \leq \mathcal{N}_\theta(X(-tn,-1)) \leq R n^{1/2}$ for each $\theta \in \{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}, \boxed{\mathrm{C}}\}$.
3. $\inf_{j \in [(1-t)n, tn]_{\mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(X(-j,-1)) \geq 2(\alpha n)^{1/2}$.
4. $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}(X(-\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha(t),-1)) \leq R^{-1} n^{1/2}$.
5. $\sup_{j \in [1,tn]_{\mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(X(-j,-1)) \leq n^\nu$.

For $t \in (1/2,1)$, $\alpha > 0$, $R > 1$, and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha) = \widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha;t,R)$ be the event that the following is true.

1. $G_n(\alpha;t,R)$ occurs.
2. $n - \rho_n^\alpha(t) \in \left[R^{-1}\alpha n, R\alpha n\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.
3. $Q_n^\alpha(t) \in \left[l - R(\alpha n)^{1/2}, l + R(\alpha n)^{1/2}\right]$.

Let

$$H_n^l(\alpha) = H_n^l(\alpha;t,R) := \widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha;t,R) \cap \left\{ \mathcal{N}_{\textcircled{\mathrm{C}}}(X(-J,-\rho_n^\alpha(t)) \leq R^{-1} n^{1/2} \right\}. \tag{98}$$



FIGURE 4. An illustration of the path D of (8) when the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l$ of Section 6.2 occurs. The event $G_n(\alpha)$ concerns the part of the path before the green segment. In particular, the path is required to stay in the first quadrant until time $-\lfloor tn \rfloor$, to stay to the right of the vertical line at distance $2(\alpha n)^{1/2}$ from the origin between times $-\lfloor (1-t)n \rfloor$ and $-\lfloor tn \rfloor$, and to be in the rectangle $\left[R^{-1}n^{1/2}, Rn^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ at time $-\lfloor tn \rfloor$; and the path at time $-\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha$ is required to be within distance at most $R^{-1}n^{1/2}$ of the horizontal axis. The event $\widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha)$ specifies additional regularity conditions for the green part of the path and the time $-\rho_n^\alpha$. The event $H_n^l(\alpha)$ is the intersection of $\widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha)$ and the event that the diameter of the purple segment of the path is at most a small constant times $n^{1/2}$. On the event $H_n^l(\alpha)$, each cheeseburger in the reduced word corresponding to the purple part of the path is matched to a cheeseburger order. This fact allows us to apply the results of [GS15, Section 2] to estimate the conditional probability of the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)$ that $H_n^l(\alpha)$ occurs and the path exits the first quadrant at the position $(0, l)$ (which lies at distance proportional to $n^{1/2}$ from the origin). Proposition 6.3 is proven by showing that if we condition on $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)$ and the approximate locations of the path at times $-\lfloor tn \rfloor$, $-\lfloor s_1 n \rfloor$, and $-\lfloor s_2 n \rfloor$, then the law of the blue part of the path is approximately that of a correlated Brownian bridge conditioned to stay in the first quadrant.

Let $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_n^l$ be the event that $J = n$, $X(-J) = \textcircled{H}$, and $|X(-J, -1)| = l$, as in Definition 3.3; and let

$$\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) = \underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha; t, R) := \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_n^l \cap H_n^l(\alpha; t, R). \tag{99}$$

Our reason for including several of the conditions in the definitions of the events of this subsection is to make the following lemma true.

Lemma 6.2. *Define the time $\rho_n^\alpha = \rho_n^\alpha(t)$ and the events as in the beginning of this subsection. Fix $t \in (1/2, 1)$ and $R > 1$. There exists $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(R)$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\alpha, R) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]$, $n \geq n_*$, and $l \geq 3R^{-1}n^{1/2}$, the following holds. On the*

event $H_n^l(\alpha) = H_n^l(\alpha; t, R)$, each cheeseburger in $X(-J, -\rho_n^\alpha - 1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-\rho_n^\alpha, -1)$.

Lemma 6.2 will allow us to apply the estimates of [GS15, Section 2] to the word $X_{-J} \dots X_{-\rho_n^\alpha - 1}$, without having to worry about the matches of $\boxed{\text{F}}$'s.

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Assume $H_n^l(\alpha)$ occurs. By definition of ρ_n^α, the word $X(\phi(-\rho_n^\alpha), -1)$ contains at most $\alpha n^{1/2}$ hamburger orders. By condition 3 in the definition of $G_n(\alpha)$ together with the definitions of ρ_n^α and $\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha$, it follows that ρ_n^α is a hamburger and $-\phi(-\rho_n^\alpha) = \widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha$. By condition 4 in the definition of $G_n(\alpha)$, we have $\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(X(-\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha, -1)) \le R^{-1} n^{1/2}$. If we choose α small enough that $R\alpha^{1/2} \le R^{-1}$ and n sufficiently large depending on α, then for $l \ge 3R^{-1} n^{1/2}$ we have by condition 3 in the definition of $\widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha)$ that

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(X(-\rho_n^\alpha, -\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha)) \ge Q_n^\alpha - \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\text{C}}}(X(-\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha, -1)) \ge R^{-1} n^{1/2}.$$

The word $X(-\rho_n^\alpha, -\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha)$ contains no flexible orders. By the definition (98) of $H_n^l(\alpha)$, we infer that each cheeseburger in $X(-J, -\rho_n^\alpha - 1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-\rho_n^\alpha, \phi(-\rho_n^\alpha))$, as required. □

The main result of this subsection is the following proposition.

Proposition 6.3. *Fix $t \in (1/2, 1)$, $R > 1$, $b \in (3R^{-1}, 1)$, $q \in (0,1)$, $s_1 < s_2 \in (1-t, t)$, and $z_1, z_2 \in (0,\infty)^2$. For $\zeta > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{P}_n^{s_1,s_2}(z_1, z_2; \zeta)$ be the event that the following is true:*

$$|Z^n(s_1) - z_1| \le \zeta n^{1/2}, \quad |Z^n(s_2) - z_2| \le \zeta n^{1/2}, \quad \text{and} \quad Z^n([s_1, s_2]) \subset (0,\infty)^2. \tag{100}$$

Also define the objects and events as in the beginning of this subsection. There exists $\zeta_* > 0$ (depending on the above parameters) such that for each $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_*]$ there exists $\alpha_* > 0$ (depending on ζ and the above parameters) such that for each $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]$, there exists $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ (depending on α, ζ, and the above parameters) with the following property. For each $n \ge n_*$ and each $l \in [bn^{1/2}, b^{-1} n^{1/2}]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $Z^n(-\cdot)|_{[s_1,s_2]}$ given $\mathcal{P}_n^{s_1,s_2}(z_1, z_2; \zeta) \cap \underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)$ and the law of a two-dimensional Brownian bridge from z_1 to z_2 in time $s_2 - s_1$ with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant is at most q.

The idea of the proof of Proposition 6.3 is to show that if we are given two realizations x and x' of $X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $G_n(\alpha)$ occurs and the corresponding realizations of $Z^n(t)$ are close together, then the conditional probabilities of $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)$ given $\{X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ and $\{X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x'\}$ are close together. We then apply Bayes' rule to invert the conditioning, and finally condition on $\mathcal{P}_n^{s_1,s_2}(z_1, z_2; \zeta)$ for $s_1 < s_2 \in (1-t, t)$.

Lemma 6.4. *Define the times $\rho_n^\alpha = \rho_n^\alpha(t)$ and $\widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha = \widetilde{\rho}_n^\alpha(t)$ and the events as at the beginning of this subsection. Fix $t \in (1/2, 1)$ and $R > 1$. For each $q \in (0,1)$, there exists $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(q, R) > 0$ and $\zeta_0 = \zeta_0(q, R) > 0$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\alpha, q, R)$ with the following property. Let $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]$, $n \ge n_*$, and $l \ge 3R^{-1} n^{1/2}$. Suppose given two such realizations x and x' for which (in the notion of (7)),*

$$||x| - |x'|| \le 2\zeta_0 \alpha n, \quad |\mathfrak{o}(x) - \mathfrak{o}(x')| \le 2\zeta_0 (\alpha n)^{1/2}, \quad |\mathfrak{c}(x) - \mathfrak{c}(x')| \le 2\zeta_0 (\alpha n)^{1/2}. \tag{101}$$

Then

$$1 - q \le \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) \,|\, X_{-\rho_n^\alpha} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) \,|\, X_{-\rho_n^\alpha} \dots X_{-1} = x'\right)} \le (1-q)^{-1}. \tag{102}$$

Proof. Let x be a realization of $X_{-\rho_n^\alpha} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $\widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha)$ occurs. By definition of $\widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha)$, if n is chosen large enough that $\alpha n^{1/2} \ge n^\nu$, then

$$(n - |x|, \mathfrak{o}(x), l - \mathfrak{c}(x)) \in \left[R^{-1}\alpha n, R\alpha n\right]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times \left[\frac{1}{2}(\alpha n)^{1/2}, 2(\alpha n)^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times \left[-R(\alpha n)^{1/2}, R(\alpha n)^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J^H_{x,m}$ be the smallest $j \geq |x|+1$ for which $X(-j,-|x|-1)$ contains m hamburgers and let $L^H_{x,m} = d^*(X(-J^H_{x,m},-|x|-1))$. Lemma 6.2 implies that we can find $\widetilde{\alpha}_* = \widetilde{\alpha}_*(R)$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$ there exists $\widetilde{n}_* = \widetilde{n}_*(\alpha,R)$ such that if $n \geq n_*$ and $l \geq 3R^{-1}n^{1/2}$, then on the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha)$ each cheeseburger in $X(-J,-\rho^\alpha_n-1)$ is matched to a cheeseburger order in $X(-\rho^\alpha_n,-1)$. Hence if $X_{-\rho^\alpha_n}\dots X_{-1} = x$, then $\underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha)$ occurs if and only if the following is true:

$$(J^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)}, L^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)}) = (n-|x|, l-\mathfrak{c}(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{i\in[|x|+1,J^H_{x,\mathfrak{o}(x)}]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(-i,-|x|-1)| \leq R^{-1}n^{1/2}.$$

By [GS15, Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 2.9],

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha) \,|\, X_{-\rho^\alpha_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right) = (1+o_\alpha(1))\mathfrak{o}(x)^{-3}\left(g\left(\frac{n-|x|}{\mathfrak{o}(x)^2}, \frac{l-\mathfrak{c}(x)}{\mathfrak{o}(x)}\right) + o_{\alpha n}(1)\right),$$

where

$$g(t,v) = a_0 t^{-2}\exp\left(-\frac{a_1 + a_2(v+a_3)^2}{t}\right)$$

for constants $a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3 > 0$ depending only on p; the $o_\alpha(1)$ is uniform in the choice of n and l as in the statement of the lemma; and the $o_{\alpha n}(1)$ is depends on α and n only through αn. The function $(s,u,v) \mapsto \alpha^{3/2}u^{-3}g\left(\frac{s^2}{u^2}, \frac{v}{u}\right)$ is continuous on $\left[R^{-1}\alpha, R\alpha\right] \times \left[(1/2)\alpha^{1/2}, 2\alpha^{1/2}\right] \times \left[-R\alpha^{1/2}, R\alpha^{1/2}\right]$, with modulus of continuity depending only on R; and is bounded above and below on this set by finite positive constants depending only on R and b.

It follows that we can find $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(q,R) \geq \widetilde{\alpha}$ such that for $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\alpha,b,R) \geq \widetilde{n}_*$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$, each $n \geq n_*$, and each l and x as above,

$$1-q \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha) \,|\, X_{-\rho^\alpha_n}\dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathfrak{o}(x)^{-3}g\left(\frac{n-|x|}{\mathfrak{o}(x)^2}, \frac{l-\mathfrak{c}(x)}{\mathfrak{o}(x)}\right)} \leq (1-q)^{-1}. \tag{103}$$

Furthermore, we can find $\zeta_0 > 0$, depending only on R and b, such that for any $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$, $n \geq n_*$, $l \geq 3R^{-1}n^{1/2}$, and any two realizations x and x' of $X_{-\rho^\alpha_n}\dots X_{-1}$ for which $\widetilde{H}^l_n(\alpha)$ occurs and (101) holds, we have

$$1-q \leq \frac{\mathfrak{o}(x)^{-3}g\left(\frac{n-|x|}{\mathfrak{o}(x)^2}, \frac{l-\mathfrak{c}(x)}{\mathfrak{o}(x)}\right)}{\mathfrak{o}(x')^{-3}g\left(\frac{n-|x'|}{\mathfrak{o}(x')^2}, \frac{l-\mathfrak{c}(x')}{\mathfrak{o}(x')}\right)} \leq (1-q)^{-1}. \tag{104}$$

By combining (103) and (104), we obtain (102) with $(1-q)^2$ in place of $1-q$. Since q is arbitrary we conclude. □

For our next lemma, we will consider the following event. For $(h,c) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, let

$$B^{h,c}_n(\zeta) := \left\{\left|\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{H}}}(X(-tn,-1)) - h\right| \leq \zeta n^{1/2},\ \left|\mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{C}}}(X(-tn,-1)) - c\right| \leq \zeta n^{1/2}\right\}. \tag{105}$$

Lemma 6.5. *Define the time $\rho^\alpha_n = \rho^\alpha_n(t)$ and the events as at the beginning of this subsection and the event $B^{h,c}_n(\zeta)$ as in* (105)*. Fix $t \in (1/2,1)$ and $R > 1$. For each $q \in (0,1)$, there exists $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(q,t,R) > 0$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$, there exists $\zeta_* = \zeta_*(\alpha,q,t,R) > 0$ such that for each $\zeta \in (0,\zeta_*]$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\zeta,\alpha,q,t,R)$ with the following property. For each $n \geq n_*$, $l \in \left[3R^{-1}n^{1/2}, 3Rn^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and $(h,c) \in \left[R^{-1}n^{1/2}, Rn^{1/2}\right]^2_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the conditional law of $X_{-\lfloor tn\rfloor-1}\dots X_{-1}$ given $B^{h,c}_n(\zeta) \cap \underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to its conditional law given only $B^{h,c}_n(\zeta) \cap G_n(\alpha)$, with Radon-Nikodym derivative bounded below by $1-q$ and above by $(1-q)^{-1}$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(q,R)$ and $\zeta_0 = \zeta_0(q,R)$ be chosen so that the conclusion of Lemma 6.4 holds with our given q, t, and R. Henceforth fix $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$ and let $n^0_* = n^0_*(\alpha,q,R)$ be as in Lemma 6.4 for this choice of α.

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l \in \left[3R^{-1}n^{1/2}, 3Rn^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, choose a finite collection $\mathcal{A}_n^l$ of disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ such that

$$\bigsqcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n^l} A = \left[n - R\alpha n, n - R^{-1}\alpha n\right]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times \left[R^{-1}(\alpha n)^{1/2}, 2(\alpha n)^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times \left[l - R(\alpha n)^{1/2}, l + R(\alpha n)^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$$

and each $A \in \mathcal{A}_n^l$ is a box in the integer lattice (i.e. a product of three discrete invervals) with dimensions at least (resp. at most) $\frac{1}{8}\zeta\alpha n \times \frac{1}{8}\zeta(\alpha n)^{1/2} \times \frac{1}{8}\zeta(\alpha n)^{1/2}$ (resp. $\frac{1}{4}\zeta\alpha n \times \frac{1}{4}\zeta(\alpha n)^{1/2} \times \frac{1}{4}\zeta(\alpha n)^{1/2}$).

Fix $q' \in (0,1)$, to be chosen later. Let $Z = (U, V)$ be a correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion as in (4) and for $r_1, r_2 > 0$, let $\tau^\alpha(r_1, r_2)$ be the smallest $s \in [0, 1-t]$ for which either $U(s) \leq -r_1 + \alpha$ or $V(s) \leq -r_2$ (or $\tau^\alpha(r_1, r_2) = 1 - t$ if no such s exists).

It follows from [She11, Theorem 2.5] and conditions 2 and 5 in the definition of $G_n(\alpha)$ that we can find $n_*^1 = n_*^1(q', \alpha, q, R) \geq n_*^0$ such that the following is true. Let $n \geq n_*^1$, $l \in \left[3R^{-1}n^{1/2}, 3Rn^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and let x be any realization of $X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $G_n(\alpha)$ occurs. Then the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law given $\{X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x\}$ of the pair

$$\left((Z^n(- \cdot - t) - Z^n(t)) \,|_{[0,1-t]}, n^{-1}\rho_n^\alpha - t\right)$$

and the law of the pair

$$\left(\widehat{Z}|_{[0,1-t]}, \tau^\alpha\left(\frac{\mathfrak{h}(x)}{n^{1/2}}, \frac{\mathfrak{c}(x)}{n^{1/2}}\right)\right)$$

is at most q'. Furthermore, by possibly increasing n_*^1 we can arrange that for each $n \geq n_*^1$, each l, x as above, and each $A \in \mathcal{A}_n^l$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left((\rho_n^\alpha, O_n^\alpha, Q_n^\alpha) \in A \,|\, X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x\right) \succeq 1$$

with the implicit constant depending only on α, ζ_0, t, and R.

It is clear that the law of $\tau^\alpha(r_1, r_2)$ depends continuously on r_1 and r_2. Hence we can find $\zeta_* = \zeta_*(\alpha, \zeta_0, q, R)$ with the following property. If $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_*]$ and we choose q' sufficiently small, depending on α, q, ζ, and R, then for each $n \geq n_*^1$; each $l \in \left[3R^{-1}n^{1/2}, 3Rn^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$; and any two realizations x and x' of $X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1}$ for which $G_n(\alpha)$ occurs, $|\mathfrak{h}(x) - \mathfrak{h}(x')| \leq 2\zeta n^{1/2}$, and $|\mathfrak{c}(x) - \mathfrak{c}(x')| \leq 2\zeta n^{1/2}$, it holds for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_n^l$ that

$$1 - q \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left((\rho_n^\alpha, O_n^\alpha, Q_n^\alpha) \in A \,|\, X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left((\rho_n^\alpha, O_n^\alpha, Q_n^\alpha) \in A \,|\, X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x'\right)} \leq (1 - q)^{-1}. \tag{106}$$

Since we chose α_* and ζ_0 so that the conclusion of Lemma 6.4 holds, we also have

$$1 - q \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) \,|\, (\rho_n^\alpha, O_n^\alpha, Q_n^\alpha) \in A,\, X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) \,|\, (\rho_n^\alpha, O_n^\alpha, Q_n^\alpha) \in A,\, X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x'\right)} \leq (1 - q)^{-1}. \tag{107}$$

By multiplying (106) and (107), then summing over all $A \in \mathcal{A}_n^l$, we obtain

$$(1 - q)^2 \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) \,|\, X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) \,|\, X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x'\right)} \leq (1 - q)^{-2}. \tag{108}$$

Now suppose we are given $(h, c) \in \left[R^{-1}n^{1/2}, Rn^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ and a realization x as above for which $B_n^{h,c}(\zeta) \cap G_n(\alpha)$ occurs. By averaging (108) over all realizations x' for which $B_n^{h,c}(\zeta) \cap G_n(\alpha)$ occurs, we obtain

$$(1 - q)^2 \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) \,|\, X_{-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \dots X_{-1} = x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha) \,|\, B_n^{h,c}(\zeta) \cap G_n(\alpha)\right)} \leq (1 - q)^{-2}. \tag{109}$$

By Bayes' rule,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{-\lfloor tn\rfloor}\dots X_{-1}=x \,|\, B_n^{h,c}(\zeta)\cap \underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)\right) = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)\,|\, X_{-\lfloor tn\rfloor}\dots X_{-1}=x\right)\mathbb{P}\left(X_{-\lfloor tn\rfloor}\dots X_{-1}=x \,|\, B_n^{h,c}(\zeta)\cap G_n(\alpha)\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)\,|\, B_n^{h,c}(\zeta)\cap G_n(\alpha)\right)}.$$

By combining this with (109) we obtain the statement of the lemma with $(1-q)^2$ in place of $1-q$. Since q is arbitrary we conclude. □

For our next lemma we will need analogues of some of the above events for a correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion. Namely, for $t\in(1/2,1)$ let $\widehat{Z}^t=(\widehat{U}^t,\widehat{V})$ be a two-dimensional Brownian motion with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time t. For $t\in(1/2,1)$ and $R>1$ let $G(\alpha)=G(\alpha;t,R)$ be the event that the following is true.

(1) $\inf_{s\in[(1-t),t]}\widehat{U}(t)\geq 2\alpha^{1/2}$.
(2) Let $\widetilde{\sigma}^{t,\alpha}$ be the largest $s\in[0,1-t]$ for which $\widehat{U}(s)\geq\alpha^{1/2}$, or $\widetilde{\sigma}^{t,\alpha}=0$ if no such s exists. Then $\widehat{V}(s)\leq R^{-1}$.

For $(u,v)\in(0,\infty)^2$ and $\zeta>0$, let

$$\widehat{B}^{u,v}(\zeta)=\widehat{B}^{u,v}(\zeta;t):=\left\{|\widehat{Z}(t)-u|\leq\zeta,\,|\widehat{Z}(t)-v|\leq\zeta\right\}. \tag{110}$$

Lemma 6.6. *Define the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)$ as in (99), the event $B_n^{h,c}(\zeta)$ as in (105), and the Brownian motion events as above. Suppose given $t\in(1/2,1)$, $R>1$, $b\in(3R^{-1},1)$, and $q\in(0,1)$. There exists $\alpha_*=\alpha_*(q,t,b,R)>0$ such that for each $\alpha\in(0,\alpha_*]$, there exists $\zeta_*=\zeta_*(\alpha,q,t,b,R)>0$ such that for each $\zeta\in(0,\zeta_*]$ there exists $n_*=n_*(\zeta,\alpha,q,t,b,R)$ with the following property. For each $n\geq n_*$, each $l\in[bn^{1/2},b^{-1}n^{1/2}]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and each $(h,c)\in[R^{-1}n^{1/2},Rn^{1/2}]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $Z^n(-\cdot)|_{[0,t]}$ given $B_n^{h,c}(\zeta)\cap\underline{\mathcal{E}}_n^l(\alpha)$ and the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\widehat{B}^{h/n^{1/2},c/n^{1/2}}(\zeta)\cap G(\alpha)$ is at most q.*

Proof. For each $\alpha,\zeta>0$, we have

$$\inf_{(u,v)\in[R^{-1},R]^2}\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{B}^{u,v}(\zeta)\cap G(\alpha)\right)>0.$$

By [GMS15, Lemma 2.8 and Theorem 4.1], for each $\alpha,\zeta>0$ and $q\in(0,1)$ there exists a positive integer $n_*=n_*(\alpha,\zeta,q,t,R)$ such that for each $n\geq n_*$ and each $(h,c)\in[R^{-1}n^{1/2},Rn^{1/2}]^2_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $Z^n(-\cdot)|_{[0,t]}$ given $B_n^{h,c}(\zeta)\cap G_n(\alpha)$ and the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\widehat{B}^{h/n^{1/2},c/n^{1/2}}(\zeta)\cap G(\alpha)$ is at most q. Note that $Z^n(-\cdot)|_{[0,t]}$ is not determined by $X_{-\lfloor tn\rfloor}\dots X_{-1}$ due to the presence of flexible orders in $X(-tn,-1)$; however, $n^{-1/2}$ times the number of such flexible orders tends to zero in law as $n\to\infty$ by [GMS15, Lemma 2.8]. We conclude by combining this with Lemma 6.5. □

Proof of Proposition 6.3. For $z_1,z_2\in(0,\infty)^2$, let $\underline{\mathbb{P}}^{z_1,z_2}_{s_2-s_1}$ be the law of a two-dimensional Brownian bridge from z_1 to z_2 in time s_2-s_1 with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant.

Since $1-t<s_1$, it follows from the Markov property and the definition of $G(\alpha)$ that for each $z_1,z_2\in(0,\infty)^2$, each $(u,v)\in\left[R^{-1},R\right]$, and each $\widetilde{\zeta}>0$, the regular conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[s_1,s_2]}$ given $\{\widehat{Z}(s_1)=z_1,\,\widehat{Z}(s_2)=z_2,\,\widehat{Z}(t)=(u,v)\}$ and the event $G(\alpha)$ is given by

$$\underline{\mathbb{P}}^{z_1,z_2}_{s_2-s_1}\left(\cdot\,|\inf_{s\in[0,s_2-s_1]}U(s)\geq 2\alpha^{1/2}\right). \tag{111}$$

As $\zeta\to0$, the regular conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[s_1,s_2]}$ given $\{\widehat{Z}(t)=(u,v)\}$ and the event $\{|\widehat{Z}(s_1)-z_1|\vee|\widehat{Z}(s_2)-z_2|\leq\zeta\}\cap G(\alpha)$ converges to its regular conditional law given $\{\widehat{Z}(t)=(u,v),\,\widehat{Z}(s_1)=z_1,\,\widehat{Z}(s_2)=z_2\}$ and the event $G(\alpha)$, uniformly over all $(u,v)\in[R^{-1},R]^2$. Hence we can find $\zeta_*=$

$\zeta_*(q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R) > 0$ such that for each $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_*]$, and $\widetilde{\zeta} > 0$, the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[s_1,s_2]}$ given $\{|\widehat{Z}(s_1) - z_1| \vee |\widehat{Z}(s_2) - z_2| \le \zeta\} \cap \widehat{B}^{u,v}(\widetilde{\zeta}) \cap G(\alpha)$ and the law (111) is at most $q/3$, where here $\widehat{B}^{u,v}(\widetilde{\zeta})$ is as defined in (110).

Furthermore, we have

$$\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \underline{\mathbb{P}}^{z_1,z_2}_{s_2-s_1} \left(\inf_{s \in [0, s_2 - s_1]} U(s) \ge 2\alpha^{1/2} \right) = 1,$$

where U denotes the first coordinate of the Brownian bridge. Therefore, we can find $\widetilde{\alpha}_* = \widetilde{\alpha}_*(q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2) > 0$ such that

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_* \le \frac{1}{2} \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \operatorname{dist}(z_i, \partial(0,\infty)^2)$$

and for each $\alpha \in (0, \widetilde{\alpha}_*]$, the Prokhorov distance between the law $\underline{\mathbb{P}}^{z_1,z_2}_{s_2-s_1}$ and the law (111) is at most $q/3$.

Henceforth fix $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_*]$. We have

$$\inf_{(u,v) \in [R^{-1}, R]} \inf_{\alpha \in (0, \widetilde{\alpha}_*]} \inf_{\widetilde{\zeta} > 0} \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{Z}(s_1) - z_1| \vee |\widehat{Z}(s_2) - z_2| \le \zeta \,|\, \widehat{B}^{u,v}(\widetilde{\zeta}) \cap G(\alpha) \right) > 0.$$

It follows that there exists $\widetilde{q}_\zeta = \widetilde{q}_\zeta(q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R)$ such that whenever $(u, v) \in \left[R^{-1}, R\right]$, $\alpha \in (0, \widetilde{\alpha}_*]$, $\widetilde{\zeta} > 0$, and $n, l \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $Z^n(-\cdot)|_{[0,t]}$ given $B^{h,c}_n(\zeta) \cap \underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha)$ and the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\widehat{B}^{u,v}(\widetilde{\zeta}) \cap G(\alpha)$ is at most $\widetilde{q}_\zeta$, then the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $Z^n(-\cdot)|_{[s_1,s_2]}$ given $\mathcal{P}^{s_1,s_2}_n(z_1, z_2; \zeta) \cap \underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha)$ and the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[s_1,s_2]}$ given $\{|\widehat{Z}(s_1) - z_1| \vee |\widehat{Z}(s_2) - z_2| \le \zeta\} \cap \widehat{B}^{u,v}(\widetilde{\zeta}) \cap G(\alpha)$ is at most $q/3$.

By Lemma 6.6, we can find $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(\zeta, q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R) \in (0, \widetilde{\alpha}_*]$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]$, there exists $\widetilde{\zeta} = \widetilde{\zeta}(\alpha, \zeta, q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R) > 0$ and $n_* = n_*(\zeta, q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R) \ge \widetilde{n}_*$ such that for each $n \ge n_*$, the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $Z^n(-\cdot)|_{[0,t]}$ given $B^{h,c}_n(\zeta) \cap \underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha)$ and the conditional law of $\widehat{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\widehat{B}^{u,v}(\widetilde{\zeta}) \cap G(\alpha)$ is at most $\widetilde{q}_\zeta$. By the triangle inequality and our choices of ζ_* and α_*, we obtain the statement of the lemma. □

6.3. **Existence of a macroscopic cone interval.** In order to apply the results of Section 6.2 to study the conditional law of $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$ given $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$, we need to show that with high conditional probability given $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$, the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}^l_n(\alpha; t, R)$ occurs with some large sub-word of $X_1 \dots X_{2n}$ in place of $X_{-n} \dots X_{-1}$. By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, it suffices to prove this when we instead condition on the event $\mathcal{E}^l_n = \mathcal{E}^l_n(\epsilon_1)$ of Definition 3.3 for $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1}\right]$ and $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ small but fixed. This is the main purpose of the present subsection.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$, and $b \in (0, 1)$ let $\iota^\beta_n = \iota^\beta_n(b)$ be the the smallest $j \in [1, J \wedge \beta n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that the following is true:

(1) $X_{-j} = \boxed{\text{F}}$, $X_{\phi(-j)} = \textcircled{\text{H}}$, and $-\phi(-j) \in [(1-\beta)n, (1-b\beta)n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$;
(2) $|X(-j, \phi(-j))| \in \left[bn^{1/2}, b^{-1}n^{1/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$;

or $\iota^\beta_n(b) = J \wedge \lfloor \beta n \rfloor$ if no such j exists. Let

$$M^\beta_n = M^\beta_n(b) := -\phi(-\iota^\beta_n) - \iota^\beta_n, \quad L^\beta_n = L^\beta_n(b) := |X(\phi(-\iota^\beta_n), -\iota^\beta_n,)|.$$

For $n, l \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha, \beta > 0$, $b > 0$, $t \in (1/2, 1-\beta)$, and $R > 1$, let $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha, \beta) = \mathcal{H}_n(\alpha, \beta; t, b, R)$ be the event that $\iota^\beta_n < J \wedge \lfloor \beta n \rfloor$ and the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}^{L^\beta_n}_{M^\beta_n}(\alpha; t', R)$ of Section 6.2 occurs with M^β_n in place of n; L^β_n in place of l; the word $X_{\phi(-\iota^\beta_n)} \dots X_{-\iota^\beta_n}$ in place of the word $X_{-M^\beta_n} \dots X_{-1}$; and t' chosen so that $t' M^\beta_n + \iota^\beta_n = tn$. See Figure 5 for an illustration.

The reason for our interest in the event $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha, \beta)$ is the following lemma.

Lemma 6.7. *Let x and x' be realizations of $X_{-\iota^\beta_n} \dots X_{-1}$ and $X_{-n} \dots X_{\phi(-\iota^\beta_n)-1}$, respectively, and let $l' \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{-\iota^\beta_n} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, X_{-n} \dots X_{\phi(-\iota^\beta_n)-1} = x',\, L^\beta_n = l',\, \mathcal{H}_n(\alpha, \beta) \right) > 0.$$



FIGURE 5. An illustration of the path D of (8) when the event $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta)\cap\mathcal{E}_n^l$ occurs for $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. On this event the path exits the first quadrant at distance proportional to $n^{\xi/2}$ from the origin, but there is a large $\pi/2$-cone interval (corresponding to the word $X_{\phi(-\iota_n^\beta)} \dots X_{-\iota_n^\beta}$, and to the part of the path not in brown in the figure) for which the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_{M_n^\beta}^{L_n^\beta}(\alpha)$ of Section 6.2 (depicted in Figure 4) occurs.

Let $m := n - |x| - |x'|$. The conditional law of $X_{\phi(-\iota_n^\beta)} \dots X_{-\iota_n^\beta}$ given

$$\left\{ X_{-\iota_n^\beta} \dots X_{-1} = x,\, X_{-n} \dots X_{\phi(-\iota_n^\beta)-1} = x',\, L_n^\beta = l',\, \mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta) \right\}$$

is the same as the conditional law of $X_{-m} \dots X_{-1}$ given the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_m^{l'}(\alpha)$ of Section 6.2.

Proof. This is proven in exactly the same manner as Lemma 3.6. □

The main goal of this subsection is to show that for any given t and β, the event $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta;t,b,R)$ occurs with high conditional probability given the event $\mathcal{E}_n^l$ of Definition 3.3 when R is large and α is small.

Proposition 6.8. *Define the events $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta) = \mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta;t,b,R)$ as in the discussion just above. For $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$, let $\mathcal{E}_n^l = \mathcal{E}_n^l(\epsilon_1)$ be the event of Definition 3.3. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta > 0$, and $C > 1$, also let $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ be the event of Definition 5.1. Suppose given $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$, $C > 1$, $q \in (0,1)$, $\beta > 0$, and $t \in (1/2, 1-\beta)$. There exists $R = R(q,\beta,t,C,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) > 1$, $b = b(q,\beta,t,C,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) \geq (3R)^{-1}$, and $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(q,\beta,t,C,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1)$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$, there exists $\delta_* = \delta_*(\alpha,q,\beta,t,C,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1)$ such that for $\delta \in (0,\delta_*]$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\delta,\alpha,q,\beta,t,C,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$ and each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta) \,|\, \mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C) \cap \mathcal{E}_n^l\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

The proof of Proposition 6.8 proceeds as follows. We first prove in Lemma 6.11 a lower bound for the probability of an analogue of the event $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta)$ for a correlated two-dimensional Brownian motion $\dot{Z}$ started from 0 conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time 1 and satisfy $\dot{Z}(1)=0$. In Lemma 6.12, we use Proposition 2.3 to transfer this to an estimate for the probability of an analogous event for a Brownian motion $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time $1-\delta$, and conditioned on the event $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ of (15) for C fixed and δ small. In Lemma 6.13, we take a scaling limit (using [GMS15, Corollary 5.9]) to obtain an estimate for the probability of the event $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta)$ conditioned on the event $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ of Proposition 5.2. We then deduce Proposition 6.8 from Proposition 5.2.

We first need to define the analogue of the event $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta)$ for a Brownian motion. For this purpose it will be convenient to introduce the following terminology, which we take from [GMS15, Appendix A].

Definition 6.9. A time t is called a *(weak) forward $\pi/2$-cone time* for a function $Z=(U,V):\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^2$ if there exists $t'>t$ such that $U_s\geq U_t$ and $V_s\geq V_t$ for $s\in([t,t']$. Equivalently, $Z([t,t'])$ is contained in the "cone" $Z_t+\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\arg z\in[0,\pi/2]\}$. We write $\overline{v}_Z(t)$ for the infimum of the times t' for which this condition is satisfied, i.e. $\overline{v}_Z(t)$ is the exit time from the cone.

Let $\dot{Z}=(\dot{U},\dot{V})$ be a two-dimensional Brownian motion started from 0 with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time 1 and satisfy $\dot{Z}(1)=0$, as in Lemma 2.2. For $\beta\in(0,1/2)$ and $b\in(0,1)$, let $\tau^\beta=\tau^\beta(b)$ be the the smallest left forward $\pi/2$-cone time s for $\dot{Z}$ such that

$$s\in[0,\beta],\quad \overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(s)\in[1-\beta,1-b\beta],\quad\text{and}\quad \dot{V}(\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(s))-\dot{V}(s)\geq b; \tag{112}$$

or $\tau^\beta=\beta$ if no such s exists. Let

$$\mathfrak{t}_\beta:=\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta)-\tau^\beta.$$

For $\alpha>0$ and $t\in(1/2,1-\beta)$, let

$$\sigma^\alpha=\sigma^{\alpha,\beta}(t,b):=\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta)\wedge\inf\left\{s\geq t\,:\,\dot{U}(s)\leq(\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta)^{1/2}+\dot{U}(\tau^\beta)\right\}$$
$$\widetilde{\sigma}^\alpha=\widetilde{\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}(t,b):=(1-t)\wedge\sup\left\{s\in[\tau^\beta,1-t]\,:\,\dot{U}(s)\geq(\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta)^{1/2}+\dot{U}(\tau^\beta)\right\}.$$

For $\alpha>0$, $\beta\in(0,1/2)$, $t\in(1/2,1-\beta)$, $b>0$, and $R>1$, let $\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta)=\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta;t,b,R)$ be the event that the following is true.

1. $\tau^\beta<\beta$.
2. $\dot{Z}(t)-\dot{Z}(\tau^\beta)\in\left[R^{-1}\mathfrak{t}_\beta^{1/2},R\mathfrak{t}_\beta^{1/2}\right]^2$, $\inf_{s\in[1-t,t]}(\dot{U}(s)-\dot{U}(\tau^\beta))\geq 2(\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta)^{1/2}$, and $\dot{V}(\widetilde{\sigma}^\alpha)-\dot{V}(\tau^\beta)\leq R^{-1}\mathfrak{t}_\beta^{1/2}$.
3. $\sigma^\alpha\in\left[\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta)-R\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta,\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta)-R^{-1}\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta\right]$ and $\dot{V}(\sigma^\alpha)\in\left[\dot{V}(\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta))-R(\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta)^{1/2},\dot{V}(\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta))+R(\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta)^{1/2}\right]$.
4. $\inf_{s\in[\sigma^\alpha,\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\alpha)]}\left(\dot{V}(s)-\dot{V}(\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta))\right)\geq-R^{-1}\mathfrak{t}_\beta$.

Remark 6.10. Condition 2 (resp. 3, 4) in the definition of $\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta)$ is a continuum analogue of the conditions in the definition of the event $G_n(\alpha)$ (resp. $\widetilde{H}_n^l(\alpha)$; $H_n^l(\alpha)$) of Section 6.2 but with $\tau^\beta-\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta)$ playing the role of n and $\dot{V}(\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta))-\dot{V}(\tau^\beta)$ playing the role of l. The reason why the intervals in the definition of $\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta)$ are scaled by $\mathfrak{t}_\beta$ or $\mathfrak{t}_\beta^{1/2}$ is as follows. We want the event $\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta)$ to be in some sense the "scaling limit" of the events $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta)$ defined above. The event $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta)$ is defined so that the event $\underline{\mathcal{E}}_{M_n^\beta}^{L_n^\beta}(\alpha;t',R)$ of Section 6.2 occurs. In particular, this latter event is defined using scales of size M_n^β or $(M_n^\beta)^{1/2}$ instead of size n or $n^{1/2}$. The quantity $\mathfrak{t}_\beta$ is the continuum analogue of the quantity M_n^β.

Lemma 6.11. *Let $\dot{Z}$ be as above. Suppose given $q\in(0,1)$, $\beta\in(0,1/2)$, and $t\in(1/2,1-\beta)$. There exists $R=R(q,\beta,t)$, $b=b(q,\beta,t)\geq 3R^{-1}$, and $\alpha_*=\alpha_*(q,\beta,t)$ such that for each $\alpha\in(0,\alpha_*]$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta)\right)\geq 1-q.$$

Proof. Since $\dot{Z}$ is a.s. continuous and a.s. does not hit $\partial(0,\infty)^2$ except at its endpoints, $\dot{Z}([1-t,t])$ is a.s. bounded and a.s. lies at positive distance from $(0,\infty)^2$. Hence we can find some $R_0 > 1$, depending only on t, such that

$$\dot{\mathbb{P}}\left(\dot{Z}([1-t,t]) \subset [R_0^{-1}, R_0]\right) \geq 1 - q. \tag{113}$$

We will next argue that $\dot{\mathbb{P}}(\tau^\beta(b) < \beta)$ is close to 1 if b is chosen sufficiently small. We do this using [MS15e, Theorem 1.1]. Let κ and p be related as in (3). Let $(\mathbb{C}, h)$ be a $4/\sqrt{\kappa}$-quantum sphere and let η is a whole-plane space-filling SLE_κ from $-\infty$ to ∞ independent from h and parametrized by quantum mass with respect to h. By [MS15e, Theorem 1.1], the left and right quantum boundary lengths (L, R) of η with respect to h evolve as a constant multiple of $\dot{Z}$. It is a.s. the case that the time reversal of η (which has the same law as η) forms a counterclockwise "bubble" which disconnects 0 from ∞ and has quantum mass at least $1-\beta$ and positive quantum boundary length. The set of times during which η is filling in such a bubble is equal to $[s, \overline{v}_{(L,R)}(s)]$ for some left forward $\pi/2$-cone time s for (L, R) with $\overline{v}_{(L,R)}(s) - s = 1 - \beta$, and the quantum boundary length of this bubble is equal to $\overline{v}_{(L,R)}(s) - s$ for this $\pi/2$-cone time s (c.f. [DMS14, Section 9]). Hence, for each $\beta > 0$ there a.s. exists some b for which $\tau^\beta(b) < \beta$, so we can find some b for which this holds with probability as close to 1 as we like. By shrinking b and using continuity, we can arrange that in fact

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau^\beta < \beta,\, |\dot{Z}(\tau^\beta)| \leq (2R_0)^{-1}\right) \geq 1 - q \tag{114}$$

with R_0 as in (113)

If $\beta < 1 - t$, then $\dot{U}(s) - \dot{U}(\tau^\beta)$ is a.s. positive for $s \in [1-t, t]$ on the event $\{\tau^\beta < \beta\}$. It follows that if $\beta < 1 - t$, then there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$, depending only on t and β, such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{s\in[1-t,t]} (\dot{U}(s) - \dot{U}(\tau^\beta)) \geq 2(\alpha_0 \mathfrak{t}_\beta)^{1/2}\right) \geq 1 - q. \tag{115}$$

Equations (114) and (115) give us a lower bound on the probability of conditions 1 and 2 in the definition of $\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha, \beta)$, except for the condition that $\dot{V}(\widetilde{\sigma}^\alpha) - \dot{V}(\tau^\beta) \leq R^{-1}\mathfrak{t}_\beta^{1/2}$. We will next find an R for which conditions 3 and 4 hold with high probability, and finally argue that $\dot{V}(\widetilde{\sigma}^\alpha) - \dot{V}(\tau^\beta) \leq R^{-1}\mathfrak{t}_\beta^{1/2}$ with high probability when α is small.

Let E_0 be the union of the events of 113, (114), and (115), so that $\mathbb{P}(E_0) \geq 1 - 3q$. On the event E_0, $\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta)$ (resp. σ^α) is the smallest $s \geq t$ for which $\dot{U}(s) \leq \dot{U}(\tau^\beta)$ (resp. $\dot{U}(s) \leq (\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta)^{1/2} + \dot{U}(\tau^\beta)$).

By Assertion 3 of Proposition 2.3, the regular conditional law of $\dot{Z}|_{[t,1-b\beta]}$ given almost any realization $\mathfrak{z} = (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})$ of $\dot{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ for which $\mathfrak{z}(t) \in \left[R_0^{-1}, R_0\right]^2$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of a Brownian motion as in (4) started from $\mathfrak{z}(t)$ and run for $1 - b\beta - t$ units of time. Now suppose given realizations $\mathfrak{s}$ of τ^β and $\mathfrak{z} = (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})$ of $\dot{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ for which E_0 can possibly occur. Then the regular conditional law of $\dot{Z}|_{[0,t]}$ given $\{(\tau^\beta, \dot{Z}|_{[0,t]}) = (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{z})\}$ and the event E_0 is the same as its conditional law given the event $G(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{z})$ that $\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta) \in [1-\beta, 1-b\beta]$ and $\dot{V}(\overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta)) - \mathfrak{v}(\mathfrak{s}) \geq b$.

Since $\mathfrak{z}(t) \in \left[R_0^{-1}, R_0\right]^2$ and $|\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{s})| \leq (2R_0)^{-1}$, we infer from the last assertion of Proposition 2.3 that the conditional probability of $G(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{z})$ given E_0 and $\{(\tau^\beta, \dot{Z}|_{[0,t]}) = (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{z})\}$ is a.s. bounded below by a constant depending only on R_0, α_0, and b. Furthermore, by our above description of σ^α and $\overline{v}(\tau^\beta)$ on the event E_0, as $R \to \infty$, the regular conditional probability given E_0 and $\{(\tau^\beta, \dot{Z}|_{[0,t]}) = (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{z})\}$ that either

$$\sup_{s\in[\sigma^\alpha, \overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta)]} |\dot{Z}(s) - \dot{Z}(\sigma^\alpha)| > R(\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta)^{1/2} \quad \text{or} \quad \overline{v}_{\dot{Z}}(\tau^\beta) - \sigma^\alpha \notin [R^{-1}\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta, R\alpha\mathfrak{t}_\beta]$$

tends to zero, uniformly over all $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$. It follows that we can find $R = R(q, t, \alpha_0, b, R_0) \geq 3b^{-1}$ and $\alpha_*^1 = \alpha_*^1(q, t, R, b, R_0) \in (0, \alpha_0]$ such that for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*^1]$, the conditional probability given E_0 that conditions 3 and 4 in the definition of $\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha, \beta)$ occur is at least $1 - q$.

Finally, by continuity, we can find $\alpha_*^2 = \alpha_*(q, t, \alpha_0, b, R) \in (0, \alpha_*^1]$ such that for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*^2]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\dot{V}(\widetilde{\sigma}^\alpha) - \dot{V}(\tau^\beta) \leq R^{-1}\mathfrak{t}_b\eta\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

By combining our above observations, we obtain that for b and R as above,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta)\right) \geq (1-3q)(1-q) - q.$$

Since q is arbitrary this implies the statement of the lemma. □

Lemma 6.12. *For $\delta > 0$ let $\widehat{Z}^\delta = (\widehat{U}^\delta, \widehat{V}^\delta)$ be a Brownian motion with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time $1-\delta$. Also let $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)$ be defined as in (27) and define the events $\mathcal{H}^\delta(\alpha,\beta) = \mathcal{H}^\delta(\alpha,\beta;t,b,R)$ in the same manner as the events $\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta)$ of Lemma 6.11 but with $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ in place of $\dot{Z}$. Suppose given $C > 1$, $q \in (0,1)$, $\beta > 0$, and $t \in (1/2, 1-\beta)$. There exists $R = R(q,\beta,t,C) > 1$, $b = b(q,\beta,t,C) \geq (3R)^{-1}$, and $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(q,\beta,t,C)$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$, there exists $\delta_* = \delta_*(\alpha,q,\beta,t,C)$ such that for $\delta \in (0,\delta_*]$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{H}^\delta(\alpha,\beta) \,|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Proof. The event $\mathcal{H}^\delta(\alpha,\beta)$ is measurable with respect to $\sigma(\widehat{Z}^\delta|_{[0,1-b\beta]})$. By Remark 2.6 and assertion 2 of Proposition 2.3, the conditional probability of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha,\beta)$ given $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)$ converges to $\mathbb{P}\left(\dot{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha,\beta)\right)$ as $\delta \to 0$. The statement of the lemma now follows from Lemma 6.11. □

Lemma 6.13. *Define the events $\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta) = \mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta;t,b,R)$ as in the beginning of this subsection. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta > 0$, and $C > 1$, also let $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ be the event of Definition 5.1. Suppose given $C > 1$, $q \in (0,1)$, $\beta > 0$, and $t \in (1/2, 1-\beta)$. There exists $R = R(q,\beta,t,C) > 1$, $b = b(q,\beta,t,C) \geq (3R)^{-1}$, and $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(q,\beta,t,C)$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_*]$, there exists $\delta_* = \delta_*(\alpha,q,\beta,t,C)$ such that for $\delta \in (0,\delta_*]$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\delta,\alpha,q,\beta,t,C) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_*$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha,\beta) \,|\, \mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Proof. Fix $\delta \in (0,1/2)$ to be chosen later. Let $\widehat{Z}^\delta$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)$, and $\mathcal{H}^\delta(\alpha,\beta)$ be as in Lemma 6.13. Define the times τ^β, $\mathfrak{t}_\beta$, and σ^α as in the discussion above Lemma 6.11 with $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ in place of $\dot{Z}$. We first claim that the conditional joint law given $\{J > (1-\delta)n\}$ of the triple

$$\left(Z^n|_{[-(1-\delta),0]},\, n^{-1}\iota_n^\beta,\, -n^{-1}\phi(-\iota_n^\beta)\mathbb{1}_{\left(\iota_n^\beta < \lfloor(1-\beta)n\rfloor\right)}\right) \tag{116}$$

converges as $n \to \infty$ to the joint law of the triple

$$\left(\widehat{Z}^\delta(-\cdot)|_{[-(1-\delta),0]},\, \tau^\beta,\, \overline{v}_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(\tau^\beta)\mathbb{1}_{(\tau^\beta<\beta)}\right). \tag{117}$$

Since τ^β is the *smallest* forward $\pi/2$ for $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ satisfying (112) (with $\dot{Z}$ in place of $\widehat{Z}^\delta$), continuity of $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ implies that on the event $\{\tau^\beta < \beta\}$, there a.s. exists a (random) interval $I \subset [0,1]$ with rational endpoints and a time $a \in I \cap \mathbb{Q}$ such that τ^β is the smallest forward $\pi/2$-cone time s for $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ in I with $a \in [s, \overline{v}_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(s)]$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\widehat{X}^n$ be a word sampled from the conditional law of X given $\{J > (1-\delta)n\}$ and let $\widehat{Z}^n$ be the path constructed from as in (9) with $\widehat{X}^n$ in place of X. By condition 4 of [GMS15, Corollary 5.9] (which is the analogue of Theorem 1.11 for words conditioned to have no burgers), we can find a coupling of the sequence $(\widehat{X}^n)$ with the path $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ such that on the event $\{\tau^\beta < \beta\}$, the following holds a.s. Let I and a be as above and let $\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta$ be the smallest $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n^{-1}i \in I$, $\widehat{X}^n_{-i} = \boxed{\text{F}}$, and $an \in [i, -\phi(-i)]$. Then we have

$$\widehat{Z}^n \to \widehat{Z}^\delta(-\cdot) \text{ uniformly in } [-1,0], \quad n^{-1}\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta \to \tau^\beta \quad \text{and} \quad -n^{-1}\phi(-\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta) \to \overline{v}_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(\tau^\beta). \tag{118}$$

Henceforth fix a coupling satisfying (118). We claim that if we define ι_n^β with the word $\widehat{X}^n$ in place of the word X, then a.s.

$$n^{-1}\iota_n^\beta \to \tau^\beta \quad \text{and} \quad -n^{-1}\phi(-\iota_n^\beta)\mathbb{1}_{(\iota_n^\beta < \beta n)} \to \overline{v}_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(\tau^\beta)\mathbb{1}_{(\tau^\beta<\beta)}. \tag{119}$$

This will prove our claim at the beginning of the proof.

First suppose $\tau^\beta < \beta$. It is a.s. the case that $\tau^\beta \in (0,\beta)$, $\overline{v}_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(\tau^\beta) \in (1-\beta, 1-b\beta)$, and $\widehat{V}(\overline{v}_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(\tau^\beta)) - \widehat{V}(\tau^\beta) > b$. Therefore, in a coupling satisfying (118), it is a.s. the case that for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta \in [1, \beta n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, $-\phi(-\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta) \in [(1-\beta)n, (1-b\beta)n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and $|\widehat{X}^n(\phi(-\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta), -\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta)| \geq bn^{1/2}$, where $\widehat{X}^n(\cdot,\cdot)$ is defined as in (5) with $\widehat{X}^n$ in place of X. By minimality of ι_n^β for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta \geq \iota_n^\beta$ and $\iota_n^\beta < \lfloor (1-\beta)n \rfloor$. By (118), $\limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{-1}\iota_n^\beta \leq \tau^\beta$. Similarly, $\liminf_{n\to\infty}(-n^{-1}\phi(-\widetilde{\iota}_n^\beta)) \geq \overline{v}_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(\tau^\beta)$.

On the other hand, suppose s is a subsequential limit of the times $-n^{-1}\iota_n^\beta$ (defined with $\widehat{X}^n$ in place of X). By [GMS15, Lemma 5.7], we have that s is a forward $\pi/2$-cone time for $\widehat{Z}^\delta$ and $-n^{-1}\phi(-\iota_n^\beta) \to \overline{v}_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(s)$. By definition of ι_n^β we have that s satisfies (112), so by minimality of τ^β we have $s \leq \tau^\beta$. By combining this with our above observation, $s = \tau^\beta$. We thus obtain (119) in the case $\tau^\beta < \beta$.

We will now complete the proof of (119) by showing that $\iota_n^\beta = \lfloor (1-\beta)n \rfloor$ for sufficiently large n whenever $\tau^\beta = \beta$. If not, then by the same argument as above, a subsequential limit s of the times $-n^{-1}\iota_n^\beta$ satisfies (112), whence $\tau^\beta < \beta$, which yields a contradiction. This completes the proof of our claim regarding convergence in law.

Our above claim implies that for each fixed $\delta \in (0,1/2)$, the conditional joint law of the triple (116) given $\mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C)$ converges as $n \to \infty$ to the conditional joint law of the triple (117) given $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)$. This convergence together with Lemma 6.12 yields the statement of the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 6.8. Combine Proposition 5.2 and Lemma 6.13. □

6.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.8.** The main input in the proof of Theorem 1.8 is the following proposition, whose proof requires most of the preceding results in the paper. See Figure 6 for an illustration.

Proposition 6.14. *Fix $s_1, s_2 \in (0,1)$, $q \in (0,2)$, and $z_1, z_2 \in (0,\infty)^2$. There is a $\zeta_* = \zeta_*(q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_*]$, there exists $n_* = n_*(\zeta, q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2)$ such that the following is true. For each $n \geq n_*$, the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $Z^n|_{[s_1,s_2]}$ given the event $\mathcal{P}_n^{s_1,s_2}(z_1, z_2; \zeta)$ of (100); and the law of a two-dimensional Brownian bridge from z_1 to z_2 in time $s_2 - s_1$ with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant is at most q.*

Proof. For $z_1, z_2 \in (0,\infty)^2$, let $\underline{\mathbb{P}}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1,z_2}$ be the law of a two-dimensional Brownian bridge from z_1 to z_2 in time $s_2 - s_1$ with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant, as in the proof of Lemma 6.3. By considering translations of a path with the law $\mathbb{P}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1,z_2}$, we can find $\eta = \eta(q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2) > 0$ with

$$\eta \leq \frac{1}{2} \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \operatorname{dist}(z_i, \partial(0,\infty)^2)$$

such that for each $w \in (0,\eta]^2$, the Prokhorov distance between the law $\underline{\mathbb{P}}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1,z_2}$ and the law

$$\underline{\mathbb{P}}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1+w,z_2+w}\left(\cdot \,|\, Z([0, s_2 - s_1]) \subset w + (0,\infty)^2\right) \tag{120}$$

is at most q.

By Lemma 3.5, we can find $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 \in (0,1)$ depending only on q and $n_*^0 = n_*^0(q) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_*^0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{G}_n' \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset\right) \geq 1 - q, \tag{121}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_n' = \mathcal{G}_n'(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ is as in Lemma 3.5. Let $\iota_0^n = \iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)$ be as in Section 3.1. Also let

$$M_n := \iota_0^n - \phi(\iota_0^n), \quad L_n := |X(\phi(\iota_0^n), \iota_0^n)|. \tag{122}$$

For $\delta > 0$ and $C > 1$, let $\dot{\mathcal{B}}_{M_n}^\delta(C)$ be defined in the same manner as the event $\mathcal{B}_{M_n}^\delta(C)$ of Definition 5.1 but with M_n in place of n and the word $X_{\iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)} \dots X_{\phi(\iota_0^n(\epsilon_0))}$ in place of the word $X_{-M_n} \dots X_{-1}$. By Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 5.3, there exists $C = C(q, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) > 0$ such that for each $\delta \in (0,1/2)$, there exists $n_*^1 = n_*^1(\delta, q, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^0$ such that for $n \geq n_*^1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\dot{\mathcal{B}}_{M_n}^\delta(C) \,|\, \mathcal{G}_n'\right) \geq 1 - q. \tag{123}$$

For $\beta \in (0,1/2)$, $t \in (1/2, 1-\beta)$, $R > 1$, $b \in (0,1)$, and $\alpha > 0$ let $\dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha,\beta) = \dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta; t, b, R)$ be defined in the same manner as the event $\mathcal{H}_{M_n}(\alpha,\beta)$ of Section 6.3 but with M_n in place of n and the



FIGURE 6. An illustration of the path D of (8) when the event $\mathcal{G}_n' \cap \dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}^\delta_{M_n}(C)$ in the proof of Proposition 6.14 occurs; equivalently, the event event $\mathcal{G}_n'$ of Lemma 3.5 occurs and the event depicted in Figure 5 occurs for the part of the curve not in red. By Lemma 3.5, the conditional probability given $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$ of the event $\mathcal{G}_n'$ is close to 1 when ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 are small and n is large. By Lemmas 3.6 and 5.3, the conditional probability given $\mathcal{G}_n'$ of the event $\dot{\mathcal{B}}^\delta_{M_n}(C)$ is close to 1 when C is large, δ is small, and n is large. By Proposition 6.8, the conditional probability given $\mathcal{G}_n' \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}^\delta_{M_n}(C)$ of the event $\dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta)$ is close to 1 when n is large. By Proposition 6.3, the conditional law of the blue segment of the curve given $\mathcal{G}_n' \cap \dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}^\delta_{M_n}(C)$ and approximate realizations of the endpoints of this segment is close to the law of a Brownian bridge conditioned to stay in the first quadrant. Combining these statements proves Proposition 6.14.

word $X_{\iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)} \dots X_{\phi(\iota_0^n(\epsilon_0))}$ in place of the word $X_{-M_n} \dots X_{-1}$. Also let $i^\beta_{M_n} = i^\beta_{M_n}(b)$ be defined in the same manner as the time $\iota^\beta_{M_n}$ of Section 6.3 but with M_n in place of n and the word $X_{\iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)} \dots X_{\phi(\iota_0^n(\epsilon_0))}$ in place of the word $X_{-M_n} \dots X_{-1}$.

By Proposition 6.1, [GMS15, Corollary 5.2], and the lower bound in [GS15, Theorem 1.10], we can find $\beta = \beta(\eta, s_1, s_2, \epsilon_0) \in (0, s_1)$ such that for each $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists $n_*^2 = n_*^2(\delta, q, \eta, \beta, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$

such that for each $n \geq n_*^2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{j \in [1, 2\beta n + \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |X(2n-j, 2n)| \leq \frac{\eta}{2} n^{1/2} \right) \geq 1 - q/2$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{j \in [1, 2\beta n + \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}]_{\mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}(X(2n-j, 2n)) \leq n^{\nu} \,|\, X(1, 2n) = \emptyset \right) \geq 1 - q/2. \tag{124}$$

Henceforth fix such a β. Also choose $t \in (1/2, 1-\beta)$ such that $1 - t < s_1 < s_2 < t$. By Lemmas 3.6 and 6.8, there exists $R = R(q, \beta, t_1, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) > 1$, $b = b(q, \beta, t, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq (3R)^{-1}$, and $\widetilde{\alpha}_* = \widetilde{\alpha}_*(q, \beta, t, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0, \widetilde{\alpha}_*]$, there exists $\delta_* = \delta_*(\alpha, q, \beta, t, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ such that for $\delta \in (0, \delta_*]$, there exists $n_*^3 = n_*^3(\delta, \alpha, q, \beta, t, C, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^2$ such that for each $n \geq n_*^3$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta) \,|\, \mathcal{B}_n^{\delta}(C) \cap \mathcal{G}_n' \right) \geq 1 - q.$$

By (123), in fact

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta) \,|\, \mathcal{G}_n' \right) \geq (1-q)^2. \tag{125}$$

Henceforth fix such an r and such a b. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{D}_n^{\beta} &:= -D\left(X(2n - \iota_0^n - i_n^{\beta}, 2n) \right), \quad \dot{W}_n^{\beta} := n^{-1/2} \dot{D}_n^{\beta}, \\ \dot{F}_n^{\beta} &:= \left\{ \mathcal{N}_{\boxed{\mathrm{F}}}\left(X(2n - \iota_0^n - i_n^{\beta}, 2n) \right) \leq n^{\nu} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{126}$$

By (124), the conditional probability given $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$ that $\mathcal{G}_n' \cap \dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta)$ occurs and either coordinate of $\dot{D}_n^{\beta}$ is larger than $\frac{1}{2}\eta$ is at most q.

By Lemma 6.7 and Proposition 6.3, there exists $\zeta_* = \zeta_*(q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R) > 0$ such that for each $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_*]$ there exists $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(\zeta, q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R) \in (0, \widetilde{\alpha}_*]$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\alpha, \zeta, q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R)$ and $n_*^4 = n_*^4(\delta, \alpha, \zeta, q, s_1, s_2, z_1, z_2, t, b, R, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ with the following property. For each $n \geq n_*^4$, the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $Z^n|_{[s_1, s_2]}$ given $\dot{D}_n^{\beta}$ and the event

$$\mathcal{P}_n^{s_1, s_2}(z_1, z_2; \zeta) \cap \dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta) \cap \mathcal{G}_n' \cap \dot{F}_n^{\beta}$$

and the conditional law of a two-dimensional Brownian bridge from $z_1 + \dot{W}_n^{\beta}$ to $z_2 + \dot{W}_n^{\beta}$ in time $s_2 - s_1$ with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the translated first quadrant $\dot{W}_n^{\beta} + (0, \infty)^2$ is at most q.

By our choice of η, on the event that each coordinate of $\dot{D}_n^{\beta}$ is at most $\frac{1}{2}\eta$ and $\dot{F}_n^{\beta}$ occurs, the Prokhorov distance between this conditional law and the law $\underline{\mathbb{P}}_{s_2 - s_1}^{z_1, z_2}$ is at most q (here the event $\dot{F}_n^{\beta}$ is used to ensure that $Z^n(2 - n^{-1}\iota_0^n - n^{-1} i_n^{\beta})$ is close to $n^{-1/2}\dot{D}_n^{\beta}$). By (121), (124), and (125), it holds with conditional probability at least $(1-q)^2 - 2q$ given $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$ that $\dot{\mathcal{H}}_{M_n}(\alpha, \beta) \cap \mathcal{G}_n'$ occurs, each coordinate of $\dot{D}_n^{\beta}$ is at most $\frac{1}{2}\eta$, and $\dot{F}_n^{\beta}$ occurs. Since q is arbitrary the statement of the proposition follows. □

Proof of Theorem 1.8. By Proposition 6.1, from any sequence of integers tending to ∞, we can extract a subsequence along which the conditional laws of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1, 2n) = \emptyset\}$ converge to the law of a random continuous path $\widetilde{Z} : [0, 2] \to [0, \infty)^2$ such that the law of $\widetilde{Z}(t)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure on $[0, \infty)^2$ for each $t \in (0, 2)$. Henceforth fix such a subsequential limit $\widetilde{Z}$.

By Proposition 6.14, for each $q \in (0, 1)$, $s_1 < s_2 \in (0, 2)$, and $z_1, z_2 \in (0, \infty)^2$, there exists $\zeta_* = \zeta_*(q)$ such that for each $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_*]$, the Prokhorov distance between the conditional law of $\widetilde{Z}|_{[s_1, s_2]}$ given $\{|\widetilde{Z}(s_1) - z_1| \vee |\widetilde{Z}(s_2) - z_2| \leq \zeta\}$ and the law of a two-dimensional Brownian bridge from z_1 to z_2 in time $s_2 - s_1$ with variances and covariances as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant is at most q. Denote this latter law by $\underline{\mathbb{P}}_{s_2 - s_1}^{z_1, z_2}$. Also let $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{s_1, s_2}^{z_1, z_2}$ be the regular conditional law of $\widetilde{Z}|_{[s_1, s_2]}$ given

$\{\widetilde{Z}(s_1) = z_1,\, \widetilde{Z}(s_2) = z_2\}$. We claim that for Lebesgue almost every $z_1, z_2 \in (0,\infty)^2$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{s_1,s_2}^{z_1,z_2} = \underline{\mathbb{P}}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1,z_2}. \tag{127}$$

Once (127) is established, the theorem follows from the uniqueness statement of Lemma 2.2 together with the second statement of Proposition 6.1.

To obtain (127), fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and times $t_1, \dots, t_N \in [s_1, s_2]$. Also let $\mathcal{C}$ be the space of continuous functions $\mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ which vanish at ∞, with the supremum norm. The space $\mathcal{C}$ is separable, so we can find a countable collection $\{f_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}$ which is dense in $\mathcal{C}$. Let $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_{s_1,s_2}^{z_1,z_2}$ and $\underline{\mathbb{E}}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1,z_2}$ denote the expectations corresponding to $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{s_1,s_2}^{z_1,z_2}$ and $\underline{\mathbb{P}}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1,z_2}$, respectively. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Psi_k, \Phi_k : [0,\infty)^2 \times [0,\infty)^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be defined by

$$\Psi_k(z_1,z_2) := \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_{s_1,s_2}^{z_1,z_2}\left(f_k\left(\widetilde{Z}(t_1),\dots,\widetilde{Z}(t_N)\right)\right), \quad \Phi_k(z_1,z_2) := \underline{\mathbb{E}}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1,z_2}\left(f_k\left(Z(t_1),\dots,Z(t_N)\right)\right).$$

By the above statement regarding Prokhorov distances, it holds for each $z_1, z_2 \in (0,\infty)^2$ that

$$\lim_{\zeta\to 0} \int_{B_\zeta(z_1)} \int_{B_\zeta(z_2)} \Psi_k(w_1,w_2)\, dw_1\, dw_2 = \Phi_k(z_1,z_2), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, for almost every $z_1, z_2 \in (0,\infty)^2$ we have

$$\Psi_k(z_1,z_2) = \Phi_k(z_1,z_2), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For every such z_1, z_2, the law of $(\widetilde{Z}(t_1),\dots,\widetilde{Z}(t_N))$ under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{s_1,s_2}^{z_1,z_2}$ agrees with the law of $(Z(t_1),\dots,Z(t_N))$ under $\underline{\mathbb{P}}_{s_2-s_1}^{z_1,z_2}$. For almost every $z_1, z_2 \in (0,\infty)^2$, these two laws agree for every finite vector of times $(t_1,\dots,t_N) \subset \mathbb{Q} \cap [s_1,s_2]$. It follows that (127) holds. □

6.5. **Proof of Theorem 1.11.** In this subsection we will deduce Theorem 1.11 from Theorem 1.8, the earlier results of this paper, and the results of [GMS15].

Lemma 6.15. *Fix $a \in (-\infty, 0)$ and $r > 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r}$ be the minimum of 0 and the smallest $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X_i = \boxed{F}$, $i \geq an$, and $i - \phi(i) \geq rn - 1$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let*

$$\overline{U}_r^n(t) := U^n(t) - \inf_{s\in[t-r,t]} U^n(s), \quad \overline{V}_r^n(t) := V^n(t) - \inf_{s\in[t-r,t]} V^n(s), \quad \overline{Z}_r^n(t) := (\overline{U}_r^n(t), \overline{V}_r^n(t)). \tag{128}$$

For each $\alpha > 0$ and $q \in (0,1)$, there exists $\zeta = \zeta(\alpha,q,a,r) > 0$ and $n_* = n_*(\alpha,q,a,r) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{t\in[a,n^{-1}\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r}-\alpha]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |\overline{Z}_r^n(t)| \geq \zeta \,|\, J > n\right) \geq 1 - q.$$

Proof. Let $\widehat{Z} = (\widehat{U}, \widehat{V})$ have the law of a correlated Brownian as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time -1 when run backward. Let $\widehat{\tau}^{a,r}$ be the minimum of 0 and the smallest $\pi/2$-cone time t for $\widehat{Z}$ such that $t \geq a$ and $t - v_Z(t) \geq r$. Also let $\overline{U}$, $\overline{V}$, and $\overline{Z}_r$ be as in (128) with $\widehat{Z}$ in place of Z^n. Observe that the zeros of $\overline{Z}_r$ are precisely the $\pi/2$-cone times t for $\widehat{Z}$ with $t - v_Z(t) \geq r$. Therefore, $\widehat{\tau}^{a,r}$ can equivalently be defined as the minimum of 0 and the smallest $t \geq a$ for which $\overline{Z}_r(t) = 0$. Hence, for each $\alpha > 0$ and $q \in (0,1)$ there exists $\zeta = \zeta(\alpha,q,a,r) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{t\in[a,\widehat{\tau}^{a,r}-\alpha]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |\overline{Z}_r(t)| \geq 2\zeta \,|\, J > n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{q}{2}. \tag{129}$$

By condition 5 of [GMS15, Corollary 5.9], the joint conditional law of the pair $\left(Z^n, n^{-1}\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r}\right)$ given $\{J > n\}$ converges as $n \to \infty$ to the joint law of the pair $\left(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{\tau}^{a,r}\right)$. The statement of the lemma now follows from (129). □

Lemma 6.16. *Suppose we are in the setting of Lemma 6.15 with $a \in (-1,0)$ and $r \in (0,1)$. For each $\alpha > 0$ and $q \in (0,1)$, there exists $\zeta = \zeta(\alpha,q,a,r,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) > 0$, $\beta = \beta(\alpha,q,a,r,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) \in (0,1/2)$, and $n_* = n_*(\alpha,q,a,r,\epsilon_0,\epsilon_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$ and each $l \in \left[\epsilon_0 n^{\xi/2}, \epsilon_0^{-1} n^{\xi/2}\right]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(-(1-\beta)n \leq \phi(\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r}) \leq \widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r} \leq -\beta n, \inf_{t\in[a,n^{-1}\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r}-\alpha]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |\overline{Z}_r^n(t)| \geq \zeta \,|\, \mathcal{E}_n^l(\epsilon_1)\right) \geq 1 - q,$$

with $\mathcal{E}_n^l(\epsilon_1)$ as in Definition 3.3.

Proof. For $\delta > 0$, let $\widehat{Z}_\delta$ have the law of a correlated Brownian as in (4) conditioned to stay in the first quadrant until time $-(1-\delta)$ when run backward. Let $\widehat{\tau}_\delta^{a,r}$ be defined as in the proof of Lemma 6.15 with $\widehat{Z}_\delta$ in place of $\widehat{Z}$. Also fix $q' \in (0,1)$ to be chosen later. For $\delta > 0$ and $C > 1$, let

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C) := \left\{ \widehat{Z}_\delta(-1+\delta) \in \left[C^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C\delta^{1/2} \right]_{\mathbb{Z}} \right\}.$$

We claim that for each $C > 1$ we can find $\beta = \beta(q', C, a, r, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in (0, 1/4)$ and $\delta = \delta(q', C, a, r, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in (0, \beta/2)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(-(1-\beta/2) \leq \widehat{\tau}_\delta^{a,r} \leq v_{\widehat{Z}^\delta}(\widehat{\tau}_\delta^{a,r}) \leq -\beta/2 \,|\, \widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C) \right) \geq 1 - q'. \tag{130}$$

This follows from the same argument used in the proof of Proposition 6.11. To be more precise, let $\dot{Z}$ be as in Lemma 6.11. The argument used in that lemma (involving CLE on a quantum sphere) shows that with high probability there is a $\pi/2$-cone interval for $\dot{Z}$ of time length slightly less than 2, so the analogue of (130) for $\dot{Z}$ is true. By Proposition 2.3 the analogue of (130) for the path $\widehat{Z}$ conditioned on $\mathcal{B}^\delta(C)$ is true for small δ. By the argument of Lemma 6.12 we then obtain (130).

Since $\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\delta(C)\right) > 0$, it follows from Lemma 6.15 and [GMS15, Corollary 5.9] that for each $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 1$, there exists $\zeta = \zeta(\alpha, q', C, \delta, \beta, a, r, C) > 0$ and $n_* = n_*(\alpha, q', C, \delta, \beta, a, r, C) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $n \geq n_*$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(-(1-\beta)n \leq \phi(\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r}) \leq \widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r} \leq -\beta n, \inf_{t \in [a, n^{-1}\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r} - \alpha]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |\overline{Z}_r^n(t)| \geq \zeta \,|\, \mathcal{B}_n^\delta(C) \right) \geq 1 - 2q'.$$

We conclude by combining this with Propositions 5.2 and 5.3. □

Lemma 6.17. *For $(a,r) \in (0,2)^2$, let $\tau^{a,r}$, $\iota_n^{a,r}$, and $\tau_n^{a,r}$ be defined as in Condition 5 of Theorem 1.11. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite collection of pairs $(a,r) \in (0,2)^2$. As $n \to \infty$, the joint conditional law given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$ of*

$$\left(Z^n|_{[0,2]}, \{\tau_n^{a,r}\}_{(a,r)\in\mathcal{A}} \right)$$

converges to the joint law of

$$\left(\dot{Z}, \{\tau^{a,r}\}_{(a,r)\in\mathcal{A}} \right).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, we can find $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 \in (0,1)$ depending only on q and $n_*^0 = n_*^0(q) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_*^0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{G}_n' \,|\, X(1,2n) = \emptyset \right) \geq 1 - q,$$

where $\mathcal{G}_n' = \mathcal{G}_n'(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ is as in Lemma 3.5. Let $\iota_0^n = \iota_0^n(\epsilon_0)$ be as in Section 3.1. If we define $\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r}$ as in Lemma 6.15 with the word $\dots X_{\iota_0^n - 2} X_{\iota_0^n - 1}$ in place of the word $\dots X_{-2} X_{-1}$, then on the event $\{\widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r} < 0\} \cap \mathcal{G}_n'$, it holds that $\iota_n^{a,r} = \iota_0^n + \widehat{\iota}_n^{a,r}$.

By Lemmas 3.6 and 6.16, for each $\alpha > 0$ we can find $\zeta = \zeta(\alpha, q, \mathcal{A}, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) > 0$, $\beta = \beta(\alpha, q, \mathcal{A}, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \in (0, 1/2)$, and $n_*^1 = n_*^1(\alpha, q, \mathcal{A}, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) \geq n_*^0$ such that for each $n \geq n_*^1$ and each $(a,r) \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\beta n \leq \phi(\iota_n^{a,r}) \leq \iota_n^{a,r} \leq 2n - \beta n, \inf_{t \in [a, \tau_n^{a,r} - \alpha]_{\mathbb{Z}}} |\overline{Z}_r^n(t)| \geq \zeta \,|\, \mathcal{G}_n' \right) \geq 1 - q, \tag{131}$$

where here $\overline{Z}_r^n$ is as in (128).

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\dot{X}^n$ be a random word with the conditional law of $Z^n|_{[0,2]}$ given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$ and let $\dot{Z}^n$ be the corresponding path, as in (9). Assume that we have defined the times $\tau_{n_k}^{a,r}$ with respect to the word $\dot{X}^n$. By Theorem 1.8, the Prokhorov theorem, and the Skorokhod theorem, for any sequence of integers tending to ∞, we can find a subsequence $n_k \to \infty$, a family of random times $\{\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r}\}_{(a,r)\in\mathcal{A}}$ coupled with $\dot{Z}$, and a coupling of $\left(\dot{X}^{n_k}, \{\tau_{n_k}^{a,r}\}_{(a,r)\in\mathcal{A}} \right)$ with $\left(\dot{Z}, \{\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r}\}_{(a,r)\in\mathcal{A}} \right)$ such that a.s. $\dot{Z}^{n_k} \to \dot{Z}$ uniformly on $[0,2]$ and $\tau_{n_k}^{a,r} \to \widetilde{\tau}^{a,r}$ for each $(a,r) \in \mathcal{A}$.

We will complete the proof by showing that in fact $\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r} = \tau^{a,r}$ for each $(a,r) \in \mathcal{A}$. By [GMS15, Lemma 5.7], each $\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r}$ is a $\pi/2$-cone time for $\dot{Z}$ with $\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r} - v_{\dot{Z}}(\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r}) \geq r$ and $\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r} \geq a$. It follows that a.s. $\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r} \geq \tau^{a,r}$.

Now suppose by way of contradiction that $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r} > \tau^{a,r}) > 0$ for some $(a,r) \in \mathcal{A}$. Then we can find deterministic $\alpha_0 > 0$ and $q_0 \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r} \geq \tau^{a,r} + 2\alpha_0\right) \geq 2q_0 \tag{132}$$

Let $\overline{Z}_r$ be defined as in (128) with $\dot{Z}$ in place of Z^n. Since $\overline{Z}_r(\tau^{a,r}) = 0$, it follows from (132) and our choice of coupling that for each $\zeta > 0$, there exists $k_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $k \geq k_*$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{t \in [a, \tau_n^{a,r} - \alpha_0]} |\dot{Z}^n(t)| < \zeta \right) \geq q_0.$$

This contradicts (131). We conclude that $\widetilde{\tau}^{a,r} = \tau^{a,r}$ a.s., which concludes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.11. By Lemma 6.17, the finite-dimensional marginals of the joint conditional law given $\{X(1,2n) = \emptyset\}$ of

$$\left(Z^n|_{[0,2]},\, \{\tau_n^{a,r}\}_{(a,r) \in \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathcal{Q} \cap (0,\infty))}\right)$$

converge as $n \to \infty$ to the corresponding finite-dimensional marginals of the joint law of

$$\left(\dot{Z},\, \{\tau^{a,r}\}_{(a,r) \in \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathcal{Q} \cap (0,\infty))}\right).$$

The statement of the theorem follows from exactly the same argument used in the proof of [GMS15, Theorem 1.9]. □

References

[Ald91a] D. Aldous. The continuum random tree. I. *Ann. Probab.*, 19(1):1–28, 1991. MR 1085326 (91i:60024)

[Ald91b] D. Aldous. The continuum random tree. II. An overview. In *Stochastic analysis (Durham, 1990)*, volume 167 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 23–70. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1991. MR 1166406 (93f:60010)

[Ald93] D. Aldous. The continuum random tree. III. *Ann. Probab.*, 21(1):248–289, 1993. MR 1207226 (94c:60015)

[Ber07] O. Bernardi. Bijective counting of tree-rooted maps and shuffles of parenthesis systems. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 14(1):Research Paper 9, 36 pp. (electronic), 2007. MR 2285813 (2007m:05125)

[Ber08] O. Bernardi. Tutte polynomial, subgraphs, orientations and sandpile model: new connections via embeddings. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 15(1):Research Paper 109, 53, 2008, math/0612003. MR 2438581 (2009f:05110)

[BGT87] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie, and J. L. Teugels. *Regular variation*, volume 27 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987. MR 898871 (88i:26004)

[BLR15] N. Berestycki, B. Laslier, and G. Ray. Critical exponents on Fortuin–Kastelyn weighted planar maps. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2015, 1502.00450.

[CC13] F. Caravenna and L. Chaumont. An invariance principle for random walk bridges conditioned to stay positive. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:no. 60, 32, 2013, math/0602306. MR 3068391

[Che15] L. Chen. Basic properties of the infinite critical-FK random map. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2015, 1502.01013.

[DMS14] B. Duplantier, J. Miller, and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity as a mating of trees. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2014, 1409.7055.

[DS11] B. Duplantier and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity and KPZ. *Invent. Math.*, 185(2):333–393, 2011, 1206.0212. MR 2819163 (2012f:81251)

[DW15a] D. Denisov and V. Wachtel. Random walks in cones. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(3):992–1044, 2015, 1110.1254. MR 3342657

[DW15b] J. Duraj and V. Wachtel. Invariance principles for random walks in cones. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2015, 1508.07966.

[FK72] C. M. Fortuin and P. W. Kasteleyn. On the random-cluster model. I. Introduction and relation to other models. *Physica*, 57:536–564, 1972. MR 0359655 (50 #12107)

[Gar11] R. Garbit. A central limit theorem for two-dimensional random walks in a cone. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 139(2):271–286, 2011, 0911.4774. MR 2828570 (2012e:60095)

[GM15a] E. Gwynne and J. Miller. Conformal invariance of whole-plane CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4,8)$. In preparation, 2015.

[GM15b] E. Gwynne and J. Miller. Convergence of the topology of critical Fortuin-Kasteleyn planar maps to that of CLE_κ on a Liouville quantum surface. In preparation, 2015.

[GMS15] E. Gwynne, C. Mao, and X. Sun. Scaling limits for the critical Fortuin-Kasteleyn model on a random planar map I: cone times. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2015, 1502.00546.

[Gri06] G. Grimmett. *The random-cluster model*, volume 333 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. MR 2243761 (2007m:60295)

[GS15] E. Gwynne and X. Sun. Scaling limits for the critical Fortuin-Kastelyn model on a random planar map II: local estimates and empty reduced word exponent. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2015, 1505.03375.

[KN04] W. Kager and B. Nienhuis. A guide to stochastic Löwner evolution and its applications. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 115(5-6):1149–1229, 2004, math-ph/0312056.

[KW14] A. Kemppainen and W. Werner. The nested simple conformal loop ensembles in the Riemann sphere. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2014, 1402.2433.

[Le 14] J.-F. Le Gall. Random geometry on the sphere. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2014, 1403.7943.

[LG13] J.-F. Le Gall. Uniqueness and universality of the Brownian map. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(4):2880–2960, 2013, 1105.4842. MR 3112934

[Mie09] G. Miermont. Random maps and their scaling limits. In *Fractal geometry and stochastics IV*, volume 61 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 197–224. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009. MR 2762678 (2012a:60017)

[Mie13] G. Miermont. The Brownian map is the scaling limit of uniform random plane quadrangulations. *Acta Math.*, 210(2):319–401, 2013, 1104.1606. MR 3070569

[MS12a] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary Geometry I: Interacting SLEs. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2012, 1201.1496.

[MS12b] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary geometry II: reversibility of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_1;\rho_2)$ for $\kappa \in (0,4)$. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2012, 1201.1497.

[MS12c] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary geometry III: reversibility of SLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4,8)$. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2012, 1201.1498.

[MS13a] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary geometry IV: interior rays, whole-plane reversibility, and space-filling trees. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2013, 1302.4738.

[MS13b] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Quantum Loewner Evolution. *ArXiv e-prints*, December 2013, 1312.5745.

[MS15a] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. An axiomatic characterization of the Brownian map. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2015, 1506.03806.

[MS15b] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity and the Brownian map I: The QLE(8/3,0) metric. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2015, 1507.00719.

[MS15c] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity and the Brownian map II: geodesics and continuity of the embedding. In preparation, 2015.

[MS15d] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity and the Brownian map III: the embedding is determined. In preparation, 2015.

[MS15e] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity spheres as matings of finite-diameter trees. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2015, 1506.03804.

[Mul67] R. C. Mullin. On the enumeration of tree-rooted maps. *Canad. J. Math.*, 19:174–183, 1967. MR 0205882 (34 #5708)

[MWW14a] J. Miller, S. S. Watson, and D. B. Wilson. Extreme nesting in the conformal loop ensemble. *ArXiv e-prints*, December 2014, 1401.0217.

[MWW14b] J. Miller, S. S. Watson, and D. B. Wilson. The conformal loop ensemble nesting field. *ArXiv e-prints*, December 2014, 1401.0218.

[She09] S. Sheffield. Exploration trees and conformal loop ensembles. *Duke Math. J.*, 147(1):79–129, 2009, math/0609167. MR 2494457 (2010g:60184)

[She10] S. Sheffield. Conformal weldings of random surfaces: SLE and the quantum gravity zipper. *ArXiv e-prints*, December 2010, 1012.4797.

[She11] S. Sheffield. Quantum gravity and inventory accumulation. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2011, 1108.2241.

[Shi85] M. Shimura. Excursions in a cone for two-dimensional Brownian motion. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 25(3):433–443, 1985. MR 807490 (87a:60095)

[Shi91] M. Shimura. A limit theorem for two-dimensional random walk conditioned to stay in a cone. *Yokohama Math. J.*, 39(1):21–36, 1991. MR 1137264 (93b:60153)

[SW12] S. Sheffield and W. Werner. Conformal loop ensembles: the Markovian characterization and the loop-soup construction. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 176(3):1827–1917, 2012, 1006.2374. MR 2979861

Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
E-mail address: ewain@mit.edu, xinsun89@math.mit.edu